

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 2, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:40 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus,
Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Absent: Duncan—1.

HEARINGS

Z-149-67

Mr. Vernon C. Fountain, planning department staff, discussed the request to permit the development of a townhouse complex under the Community Unit Plan section of the ordinance. He spoke in regard to the proposed use, parking ratio, proposed density, size and location of the property, ingress and egress to the site, and land use in the vicinity.

No one appeared in regard to the above proposal.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

(See page 6 regarding additional comments on this matter).

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:50 P.M.

Z-157-67

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property on the 4400 block of North Grand River Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional office district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-158-67

Mr. Francis Fine appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3325 E.

Michigan Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "D-1" professional office district.

Mr. Fine stated the subject property is proposed for the erection of an office building.

Mrs. Pollack, 253 Highland Street, East Lansing, Mr. Bernhard Weinberg, 301 Highland Street, and Mrs. Harold Hyde, 307 Highland Street appeared in regard to the proposed amendment, stating they were desirous of more complete information as to what exactly is proposed on the property.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-159-67

Mr. Louis Hufnagel, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 800 W. Mt. Hope Avenue, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Hufnagel stated the purpose of the petition is to allow for expansion either by adding on to the existing building or possibly erecting a new one. At present only the building is zoned "F" commercial which prevents making any changes or additions without going through the rezoning process. Mt. Hope Avenue is primarily a commercial street and there would be ample space for customer parking.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the possibility of having more definite plans regarding proposed expansion on the site.

Mr. Black asked if it would be possible for the Staff to figure out how much of an addition he would be able to put on the store and how much parking he would need to go with it? He would like to have this information for the next Board meeting.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-160-67

Mr. James Burns, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the 2900 block Maloney, 2200 block Dunlap, and 2900 block Pleasant Grove Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Burns stated that Lot No. 4 is not to be included in the petition for rezoning as was originally filed. Lot No. 7 is contemplated to be developed first, with a twelve unit apartment. The Lot size is 66 ft. by 305 ft.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-161-67

This petition is to rezone property in the 300 block of Willard Avenue, from "A-1" family to "D" apartment district.

A letter from W. Richard Neller, Walter Neller Company, agents for the property owners was distributed to the Board. The letter contained information regarding proposed development on the subject property.

Mr. Keith Wright, speaking for his mother Millie Wright, 326 Willard Avenue, commented in regard to access to the park behind the subject property, questioned the notification of more people in the area of a subject rezoning rather than just the adjacent property owners, and requested more information as to what is proposed for the subject property.

Three persons were present interested in this rezoning application.

Mr. Black questioned if the access to the park was publicly owned? Mr. Wright stated the access was off Maplewood Street and he believed it was publicly owned.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-162-67

Mr. Jon Anthony, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2208 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Anthony stated that the subject property adjoins their property on the East and would give them a much needed addition to the present property. The commercial zoning would act as a buffer to the industrial area at the rear. They plan to tear down their present building and erect a new one with the parking at the front of the building.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-163-67

Mr. C. W. Baxter, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3418 Forest Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Baxter stated that since this petition was applied for he had agreed to negotiate to sell the subject property and asked that the Board table this matter for thirty days.

Mr. Nino, planning staff, related that Michigan State University indicated objection to the subject petition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-164-67

Mr. William A. Gill, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1021-23 N. Logan Street, from "B-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Mr. Gill stated his intention was to enlarge the present building on the South side to allow expansion which is necessary at this time. They have parking space on the North side of the building for about 15 cars.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-165-67

Marjorie Holmgren, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 6826 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling or "G" business district.

Mrs. Holmgren stated that the buildings on the property are badly deteriorated and that she intends to sell the property.

Three adjacent property owners spoke in regard to the subject property regarding its present run down condition and desiring more information as to what might be proposed for the site.

Approximately 9 persons were present interested in the subject property.

Mr. C. W. Baxter, 3418 Forest Road, appeared in support of the proposed rezoning.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-166-67

James Burns, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property in the 5300 block of S. Cedar Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial.

Mr. Burns stated their desire is to rezone a small piece of property (20 ft. x 20 ft.) to erect an elevated sign for the auto wash to be constructed at the far rear of the premises. A picture of the proposed sign was shown to the Board. Copies of the sign specifications and type will be sent to the Board.

Mr. Siebert questioned the sign setback recommendations in this area.

The Director stated the Board's policy has been to concentrate the signs for a number of businesses on one central signpost.

Mr. Burns stated that the subject property is not part of a shopping center.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-167-67

Frank Basel, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone the rear portion of the property at 1415 E. Grand River Avenue, from "B-1" family to "G" business district.

Mr. Basel spoke in regard to his need for additional space for warehousing.

Mr. Robert Reed, 1417 Congress Street, questioned the type and size of the proposed building.

Mr. Floyd Skinner, 1414 Congress Street, questioned the ingress and egress from the proposed building, asked for more information regarding the proposal, and stated there is a definite need for a buffer zone to conceal the back of the present structure.

Mr. Basel stated ingress and egress would be from Grand River Avenue.

John Assif, 805 Clyde Street, stated that the type of building proposed should be specified and one that will compliment the neighborhood.

Mr. Basel replied the building proposed is 50 ft. x 70 ft., two floors. Elijah Basel spoke in support of the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-168-67

Louis A. Smith, Attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property

at 4903 W. Grand River Avenue, from "E-2" drive-in to "G-2" wholesale district.

Mr. Smith stated he was present to answer any questions which may be presented.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-169-67

Mr. James Burns, Attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3328 W. Jolly Road, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mrs. Gordon Wilson, 318 W. Jolly Road stated there were 12 persons present in opposition to this rezoning for whom she was the speaker. She presented a petition containing 52 signatures in opposition to the proposed rezoning, which was received and placed on file. She stated that this rezoning would be contrary to good land use and that it would constitute a spot zone. She commented in regard to the size of the structure proposed, parking required, and possible effects of this type of development on surrounding property owners.

Mr. Reynolds asked what type of development the surrounding property owners would like to see on the subject property, and Mrs. Wilson replied they desire a two family dwelling on the property.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-170-67

Mr. Dave Connelly, 311 N. Logan, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone a property, at 311-313 North Logan and 1114 W. Ionia from "B-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Connelly stated there had been nothing designed for the subject property that it is for speculative purposes.

A property owner on Bartlett Street, questioned whether the Central City Plan designated apartments this far West of the center city and also requested more information as to what is proposed for the subject property. The Director replied the Central City Plan proposed multiple dwellings up to East side of Logan Street. Policy regarding the West side of Logan is presently under discussion.

RE: Z-149-67

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Dalman, 2821 Aurelius Road, asked for a clarification of

the proposal which was given by Mr. Fountain. Mr. Dalman spoke in regard to the size of the proposed project, which is 96 dwelling units in 12 buildings, plus a community center. He also questioned sewer capacity, increased traffic conditions, future development in the area, and possible effects on single family residents in the area.

The Director related the future development proposed for the Forest View Community contained in a policy plan not yet formally adopted. He stated the sewer would serve about 12,000 people, with the size of the pumps to be increased. He stated that Aurelius Road is designated as a major street, however eventually it would have to be widened.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Pat Callihan, developer, elaborated on the proposed project. He stated the proposed density for the area is 12 units per acre, however, they are proposing 8 units per acre. He thought the proposal would be an asset to the area.

Mr. Black questioned the fact that according to the map at least 50% of the subject area is in the flood plain and if the developer was aware of this fact.

Mr. Callihan replied they were aware of this fact.

Mr. Nino referred to a letter dated December 22, 1967 from the Water Resources Commission concluding "Thus, we have no objections to the plan from a hydraulic standpoint."

Mr. Black questioned if the same opinion would apply to the property North of the subject property and if the land to the West was private or publicly owned.

The Director replied that the majority of the land was publicly owned.

Discussion followed.

Matter again referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess 9:40 P.M. to 10:45 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the minutes of December 5, 1967 be approved subject to the following correction:

Page 8, Subdivision Ordinance—"Mr. Black stated that the draft of the subdivision control has been reviewed and the Committee has recommended to the Staff also review this matter with local groups who are directly involved in development, after which a public hearing will be held."

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-214-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition for a Community Unit Plan on the property at 3831 Moores River Drive, be tabled to January 16, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Mr. Fink recommended that all other zoning matters on the Board's agenda be postponed until the January 16, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board.

All Board members concurred in this recommendation.

STREETS COMMITTEE

SS-14-67 South Logan Street Zoning Policy

A meeting is to be arranged for Streets Committee and the Zoning Committee to consider the South Logan Street policy and the draft of the resolution concerning same.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

A meeting is to be arranged between the Staff and the Capital Improvements Committee for discussion of the 1967-73 Capital Improvements Program.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director stated that copies of the Workable Program will be presented to the Board at the January 16, 1968 meeting of the Board.

SS-20-67

A status report of the Community Shelter Plan has been included in the Staff Report for the Board's perusal.

The Director reported that a bus tour of Urban Renewal Project No. 2 is being planned by the Redevelopment Department for Sunday, January 14, 1968 at 10:00 A.M., which will last about two hours. The Board is to receive written notice regarding this matter.

A letter from the Community Services Council regarding co-sponsoring a brother-

hood banquet on January 18, 1968 was read to the Board. This co-sponsorship entails no cost to the Planning Board.

Motion by Duncan seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board co-sponsor the luncheon.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Fink and Mr. Duncan to be the delegates from the Planning Board to attend the banquet.

A letter from the Michigan Municipal League regarding the annual regional meeting for all Municipal Officials in Region 11 to be held on Thursday, February 1, 1968 at Jackson, Michigan was read by the Director.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that two Staff members be authorized to attend the meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

A letter from Richard E. Elbert, Secretary of the Lansing Citizens Advisory Committee for Community Improvement regarding a dinner meeting to be held on January 11, 1968 at 6:00 P.M. was read to the Board.

Mr. Black plans to attend this meeting.

All Board members were urged to attend, if possible, the above mentioned meetings.

Mr. Guernsey commented in regard to League of Womens Voters presentation entitled "Is Social Government Obsolete?" He stated he would be speaking not as Board or Council spokesman, but purely his own thoughts based on his experience in the area.

Executive and Finance Committee's should be involved in budget preparation which is due the end of January.

Should also consider the review of whole planning process and objectives which has previously been referred to Board. Special meeting if possible.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

N/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 16, 1968

The meeting was called to order by
Chairman Ramona Bretz, at 7:40 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink,
Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Absent: None.

HEARINGS

SS-23-67

James A. Church, planning department staff, discussed the proposed revision of zoning forms which pertains to the process of petitioning for zoning changes and the requirements of filing same. Mr. Church stated that experience as it relates to the form of petition for rezoning reveals that the present petition form does not result in producing the kind of information necessary to process zoning applications. The Staff commented that the application form does not provide for the presentation of sufficient description of what the petitioner wants and is inadequate in the sense that site plans showing existing and future conditions do not have to be described. The Staff finds that it is absolutely necessary to have a more detailed submission and that this will expedite the rezoning process. A suggested petition form has been submitted to the Board.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-27-67

Mr. Church discussed the proposed addition to the Zoning Code. Section 36-25 (a) regarding a low density multiple development provision. At the present time the Zoning Code provides for a high density multiple district ("D-1") and a medium density multiple district ("D-M"). The proposed amendment would allow approximately 12 units per acre, which is a desirable density for the townhouse type of multiple developments that are oriented to family use.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-28-67

Mr. Church discussed the proposed amendment to Section 36-36 of the Zoning Code which would provide for a maximum lot coverage by a main building not to exceed 35% of which not more than 50% of the vacant area could be used for off-street parking. It would also delete the last paragraph of Section 36-46 which allows a single family residence to be built on a lot of record in the "D-M" district.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-29-67

Mr. Church discussed the proposed amendment of Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code. Section 36-7 allows the development of a Community Unit Plan on a parcel of land of not less than one (1) acre. In that the Community Unit Plan allows more than one building on a parcel and additional accessory uses, it is more applicable to a parcel of land of adequate size to allow the flexibility which is intended in a Community Unit Plan. The proposed amendment would increase minimum area required from one (1) to five (5) acres, and require that the plan submitted be consistent with the policy plan adopted by the Planning Board.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Recess from 7:50 to 8:30 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Motion by Black, supported by Gaus, that the minutes of December 19, 1968 be approved as written.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-121-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the revised amendment by Charles E. Kuhlman and Herman Davidson to amend the Community Unit Plan located at 3416 Stabler, be approved to reflect one 6 unit and one eight unit grouping of Townhouses and that; the South 52 ft. 4 in. of outlot "B" be utilized to accomplish this change.

The Planning Board further recommends that the balance of Outlot "B" be improved and maintained for recreational purposes.

It is the opinion of the Board that the proposed revision to Townhouse Units would constitute an improvement upon the original design which proposed two eight unit conventional apartment buildings. Furthermore the smaller size of the Townhouse Units would be more compatible with the surrounding duplex developments.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-214-65

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by William and Dorothy McCurdy to rezone property at 3831 Moores River Drive, from "A-1" family residential to a Community Unit Plan be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The site plan and landscape plan as approved be adhered to.
 - a. Parking shall be 2.0 spaces per unit.
 - b. The total number of units shall not exceed 14.
 - c. The house shall be bricked to conform to the style of the apartment building.
 - d. That the landscape plan be adhered to and fencing be provided along the north and east lines of the property.

Type of fencing is subject to approval of the Planning Department.

2. That the land be platted in conformance with the plans for Moores River Drive.
3. The approval shall be for a period of one year. No occupancy permits shall be issued until the final plat is recorded.

Mr. Black stated that he had consistently opposed this on the basis of the traffic pattern on Moores River Drive and Waverly Road. He recalled the Staff was directed to obtain written opinions from the City Engineer, the Traffic Department, and the County Traffic Department stating whether or not they believe this development would aggravate the traffic problem at this intersection. I stated if they obtained such a thing I would vote for it and if not. I would still vote against it.

Mr. Ronald Nino of the Planning Department Staff replied that a communication had been received from the Traffic Department, that there had been no reply from the County Road Commission at this time. The communication from the Traffic Department was read to the Board. Public Service suggested traffic pattern shown to the Board.

Discussion followed.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—5.

Nays: Black, Fink and Gaus—3.

Z-188-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board after considering the request by Homer and Thayer Winegardner and Burdette Bottom for a Community Unit Plan approval for property located in the 1800 and 1900 blocks of Hoyt Street, recommends that they would invite a Community Unit Plan on the property which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Boards adopted policy.
2. That the gross density not exceed 12 dwelling units per acre.
3. That the Applicant work out details of housing types and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-121-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board after considering the request by Lee Halstead for a Community Unit Plan approval for property at 2400 block of East Jolly Road, recommends that they would invite a Community Unit Plan for the subject property which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.
2. That the gross density not exceed 8.5 dwelling units per acre.
3. That the applicant work out details of housing types and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
4. That prior to formal submission of the request plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-138-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald Ducharme, to rezone a parcel at 1601 E. Cavanaugh Road, from non-conforming industry to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied as filed, and that we invite the submission of a Community Unit Plan which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy, and that the density shall not exceed 5 dwelling units per gross acre.
2. That the applicant work out details of housing types and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
3. That prior to formal submission of the required plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-139-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. Ralph Spagnuolo, to rezone parcels at 4326 S. Cedar, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial be denied as filed, and that portion of the property herein described now known as Lots 26 and 27 of Assessor's Plat No. 56, City of Lansing, described as the East 198.2 ft. of Lot No. 26, except the West 10.5 ft. of the North 80 ft. thereof and all of Lot No. 27 be rezoned from "C-2" family to "E" apartment shop and "J" parking, subject to a site plan being submitted showing the location of buildings and off-street parking area.

The Board further recommends that the amendment by Gertrude Bloomquist and Kenneth W. Weaver to include the property at 4318 S. Cedar and 4408 S. Cedar Street be considered on the same basis. The properties to be considered are described as follows:

4318 S. Cedar Street the East 165 ft. of Lot No. 20 Supervisor's Plat No. 2, City of Lansing.

4408 S. Cedar Street Lot No. 28 Assessor's Plat No. 56, City of Lansing.

be rezoned from "D-1" professional to "E" apartment shop district. With screening to be provided along the West property lines except for the residential set-back on Everettdate Avenue.

The Board does not believe this type of development would be objectionable, or have any adverse affect on the existing or potential residential development to the West, providing the intensity of the commercial uses are limited and adequate off-street parking and screening is provided.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-142-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Clyde and Vivian Corbett, Henry and Margaret Vida and Harrison and Caroline Winters to rezone a parcel at 912, 922, 924 S. Pennsylvania Avenue from "C-2" family residence to "E-2" drive-in district be denied.

An identical petition for rezoning this property was made to the City Council on May 29, 1967. After a period of study the Planning Board recommended that the petition be denied. City Council concurred and the petition was denied on October 9, 1967.

The applicant in support of this petition has made several statements which should be clarified.

The applicants' suggestion that the residential character of this area is being destroyed is not supported by either a visual analysis or by the study and treatment proposals of the Community Renewal Programs. Specifically this area is indicated as a conservation and minor rehabilitation area.

The reconstruction of Pennsylvania Avenue, at an increased public expense, as a boulevard street was obviously an attempt to preserve the residential character of this area.

Perhaps an examination of the number of service stations located on Pennsylvania Avenue South of the I-496 expressway would be helpful. Between this site and Miller Road a distance of approximately 4 miles there are 10 service stations, three of which are within one mile or approximately two or three minutes travel time. Based on these facts it would not seem that any tremendous need for a service station at this location exists.

It is the Board's opinion that, in the absence of any compelling reasons which are substantially related to the public interest, the Board should reaffirm its previous recommendation.

A petition with 45 names was presented in objection to the proposed amendment. There were three people in the audience who also objected the proposed amendment.

The recommendation was by seven yeas and one abstaining vote.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-145-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that in regard to the petition by Francis N. Fine, to rezone a parcel at Waverly Road and Grand River, from "A-1" residential district to "F" commercial district, an area not exceeding five acres created by the realignment of Waverly Road be rezoned from "A-1" to "F" commercial, subject to:

1. The property being platted, reflecting a satisfactory realignment of Waverly Road.
2. The developer submitting a site plan to reflect the following:
 - a. Location of buildings and off-street parking. Parking to be provided at a ratio of 4 sq. ft. of parking for every 1 sq. ft. of floor area contained within the shopping area.
 - b. Point of ingress and egress to the site.
 - c. Areas designated for loading and unloading.
 - d. Landscaping of the entire site.
3. Screening to be provided along the West property.
4. Lighting of the parking areas to be provided at a minimum of 2/10 lumens light per sq. ft.

The above conditions are subject to review by the Planning Department prior to the issuance of building permits.

The Board believes that the location of this site meets the basic criteria for commercial development, as outlined in the first part of this report, and that the reduction in size may allow for a more comprehensive development of this site and the site to the East that was rezoned by action of the City Council November 27, 1967.

Three persons were present at the public hearing in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-147-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Richard Barry, to rezone a parcel at 4200 Block Lowercroft Street, from "A-1" family district to "C-2" district be denied.

Zoning assumes that land differs as to the use for which it is best suited based on its relationship to other uses, physical features, and facilities available.

The site under consideration is located within a predominately single family area with the exception of the radio station adjacent to the East.

The lots in this area were platted prior to annexation and do not reflect the minimum width as required by the City of

Lansing (60 ft.) The present density developed under these conditions is approximately 8 dwelling units per acre. The density allowed under "C-2" family as requested would establish a gross density of 17.4 dwelling units per acre on these four lots. The net result would be a change in character for the area.

Off street parking as shown on the proposed plan (1 space per unit) is not considered adequate under present day standards. Sanitary sewers serve the area but at the present time no storm sewers exist.

Based on the foregoing analysis the Board does not believe the requested change would be in keeping with sound zoning controls.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-148-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by M. Elvin Childers, to rezone a parcel at 2816 W. Miller Road, from "A-1" family district to "H" light industrial district be denied.

Much of this area developed prior to annexation to the City of Lansing. In many cases residential and industrial uses were allowed to intermix without any basic consideration for existing development or conformity with an overall development plan.

Lansing's Master Plan is quite specific regarding the industrial areas of the City. A special survey was made to find the locations best suited to accommodate the industrial demands of the community. The following characteristics were considered in analyzing potential sites, and in many cases, are applicable to existing development.

- a. Transportation—accessibility by rail, highway and air facilities.
- b. Topography—levelness, freedom from flooding and adverse soil conditions.
- c. Utilities and services—ease and economy of serving with utilities and services.
- d. Effect on surrounding property—absence of nuisance aspect or prospect of otherwise damaging adjacent property.
- e. Location in overall plan—suitability with respect to relative need for other uses.

f. Accessibility to workers—appropriately located as to be readily accessible to workers from residential areas.

g. Size of site—large enough to provide sufficient acreage for modern facilities and space for future expansion.

In applying these characteristics to this site or property in the area, it is apparent why the Master Plan set forth these guidelines. Residents in the area filed a petition opposing this change in zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-150-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by E. Basel, to rezone the property at 2328 Commonwealth, from "B-1" family to "H" light industrial district be granted, and further recommend that a hearing be set and the property owners be notified of said hearing to consider rezoning the balance of the area lying northwest of High Street and east of Commonwealth Avenue.

The existing development in this area is substandard and the area is indicated as a renewal area by the Community Renewal Program. The area is also part of the proposed model cities neighborhood. The comprehensive Master Plan indicates this area as a future industrial district. The area is also subject to the adverse influences of a fertilizer plant which is located a short distance north of the site. Granting this request will permit development of this site and may spur redevelopment of other lots in the area by private developers.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-151-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Harold D. Smith and Douglas L. Bartrem, to rezone property at 5510 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" family district to "F" commercial district be denied.

The subject property falls within the area encompassed by the proposed South Logan Zoning Policy which is currently being considered by the Planning Board.

The policy provides that this site along with the adjacent non-conforming uses be acquired and redeveloped with multiple family residential uses.

The existing use on the site is an archery supply shop and indoor range. The rear portion of the property has been used as an outdoor range, however, this use according to conversations with the applicant is not an integral part of the operation.

It would seem that this use could relocate in a shopping center or some other general commercial area. The South Logan Zoning Policy proposes a commercial area south of Miller Road within which this use could relocate.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-152-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Thomas G. Sinas, for the rezoning of property at 521 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling district to "D-1" professional district be granted and further recommend that Lot 2, 527 N. Capitol owned by Mark and Bessie Shepard, and Lots 5, 6, and south 1 rod, Lot 4 also south 6 rods of east 2 rods Lots 7, and 8, 505 N. Capitol owned by the Michigan Catholic Conference, all property located in Block 70 Original Plat, City of Lansing, be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district.

These changes are in conformance with the Central City Plan and could help relieve pressure for changes in the area which do not conform to the plan.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-153-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that in regard to the petition by Francis N. Fine, to rezone property at 3000-3500 N. Waverly Road from "A-1" family district to "D-M" multiple dwelling district the area North of Wilson Street extended, be rezoned from "A-1" family

to "D-M" multiple dwelling district subject to the following conditions:

1. That the area be platted, and that the preliminary plat be filed and approved prior to the approval of the zoning.
2. The plat should reflect a satisfactory realignment of Waverly Road and extension of Wilson Street. The area recommended for commercial use (Z-145-67) and created by the realignment of Waverly Road should be included on the plat and not exceed five acres in size.
3. That a plat restriction be recorded on the final plat limiting development to 12-14 dwelling units per net acre.

Condition number 3 may be eliminated if the proposed amendment to the Zoning Code is adopted to include the "D-M.1" zoning for the property North of Wilson Street.

The Board further recommends that the area South of Wilson Street extended be considered on the basis of a Community Unit Plan and that generally the types of housing units be limited to single family, duplexes, quadrafoils and townhouses, and that the lowest density types of the above be oriented to the existing single family development. The concentration of large parking areas to be eliminated where possible, and oriented away from the existing single family development. Screening and landscape plans to be submitted upon approval of the site plan.

The Board believes that a portion of the subject property meets the basic criteria for apartment or townhouse development, more specifically described as the area lying north of Wilson Street extended west to Waverly Road. This area has ease of access to two major streets, with walking distance of a proposed shopping center, strategically located in relation to centers of employment, and is located in such manner that there is no direct exposure to development of a higher classification.

There are two elementary schools in the area (Northwestern and Cumberland) both of which are operating near capacity and only one (Northwestern) which can be considered within a reasonable distance to serve the area under consideration. It may be feasible to consider the possibilities of providing additional facilities in the area south of Wilson Street extended at the time a firm determination is made regarding the land use development.

Approximately 100 persons were present at the public hearing interested in the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Black stated that Mr. Fine had assured the Board at the last meeting that the property North of Wilson Street could be developed as turnkey project. He questioned if anything in the Board's recommendation could prevent the development of turnkey in the subject area? Mr. Sie-

bert stated there was nothing in the recommendation to prevent the development of turnkey housing in the subject area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-154-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Keith Granger, to rezone property at 3012 North East Street, from "A-1" family, "J" parking and "F" commercial districts to "J" parking and "F" commercial districts be denied.

The Board believes the present zoning should be retained until there is a means of applying controls for curb cuts, which should include location, width and directional flow of traffic.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Duncan—1.

Z-155-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Edward E. Meier, to rezone property at 1718 Indiana Avenue, from "B-1" family district to "C-2" family district be granted.

The Board does not believe this change will adversely affect any adjoining property, and because of its proximity to Bancroft Park lends itself to this type of use.

The lot area of the site (6,600 sq. ft.) meets minimum which was recommended by the Board as an amendment to the "C-2" district.

There were no objections to the proposed amendment.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-156-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank and Betty Szedlak, to rezone property at

329 Regent Street, from "B-1" family district to "F-1" commercial district be denied.

Automatic car washes are a relatively recent development and has brought with it new problems of public regulation. Formerly car washing was done at service stations, now the motorists line up with others at the car wash and a short time later vehicle is moved through the washing facility and comes out clean. While this sounds simple and convenient it may and often does create problems of traffic congestion, off-street parking, interference with sidewalks and noise. Where there is insufficient room on lot space to store cars, lines frequently extend over the sidewalk and may occupy major portions of the street disrupting traffic flow. An unusual amount of noise is created by the traffic and sound of motors as well as by the machinery and hissing of steam.

The inclusion of provisions for marketing gasoline and oil will only worsen the situation by promoting further conflicts within the site itself.

The location of this site with respect to the residential land use pattern makes this a spot zoning and will no doubt lead to further requests for commercial zoning.

It should be pointed out that this area has rated as a neighborhood which can be rehabilitated. This would seem to indicate that the neighborhood still exhibits a reasonable degree of stability, however, the intrusion of commercial uses may destroy this stability.

The Board is of the opinion that this use should be located in an area which is severely separated from any residential development and on a site which is large enough to provide for storage of vehicles on the site. An examination of various ordinances reveals that most require space for at least 10 vehicles with some requiring as many as 35 off street spaces.

No objections were made to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-14-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert, that the Planning Board advise City Council that the Planning Board at its meeting of January 16, 1968 adopted and recommended a policy for the consideration of land uses on South Logan Street and a plan for redevelopment of those areas of the said street which would be inconsistent with the proposed land use plan.

The Board through its Staff has made a detailed survey of South Logan Street be-

tween Holmes Road and the I-96 expressway and has determined that it is not in the public interest to encourage the entire street to develop with strip commercial uses and that certain of those commercial uses which now contribute to this situation should be eliminated through a local redevelopment program. It is the opinion of the Board that non-conforming uses should be eliminated as permitted by State enabling legislation. To not do so is inconsistent with this legislation and desirable planning principles. The purpose of the State legislation is to permit local municipalities to correct past errors and mistakes in good functional land use relationships. If we are not prepared to take advantage of these provisions of state planning legislation then should we assume that the status quo is desirable and in this case strip commercial development is to be encouraged

Specifically the Board adopted the following resolution:

WHEREAS the provisions of Act 285 of the Public Acts of 1931 of the State of Michigan, as amended, provides for the making and adopting of a plan for the physical development of a municipality, and

WHEREAS under the provisions of Act 207 of the Public Acts of 1921 of the State of Michigan, as amended, cities and villages have the power to acquire by purchase, condemnation or otherwise private property for the removal of non-conforming uses and structures, and

WHEREAS this Planning Board in the exercise of its duties and responsibilities holds this exercise of power to be desirable in order to correct land use patterns which are disruptive to good land use relationships both economically and environmentally, and

WHEREAS a situation of this type is deemed to exist on South Logan Street from Holmes Road South to the I-96 expressway, and

WHEREAS said section of South Logan is characterized by a mixed land use pattern with several non-conforming commercial uses which are adversely affecting the said street, and creating undesirable land use relationships, and

WHEREAS this Planning Board is desirous of correcting this situation and improving said land use relationships,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board of the City of Lansing recommends to the City Council that they adopt the Logan Street Zoning Policy Plan hereto attached and effectuate said plan in the manner recommended.

The Logan Street Zoning Policy Plan referred to in the above resolution is herewith submitted to the Council for its consideration. It is the Planning Board's hope that the Council will endorse this plan and

in so doing it will become the basis upon which future rezoning applications will be based. In the matter of eliminating non-conforming uses it is imperative that Council advise the Board if it is prepared to take the action recommended, so that in the event Council is not in agreement with this policy it, the Board can reconsider the feasibility of rezoning all non-conforming uses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-54-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that after consideration by the Board of a request from a property owner of Meadow Wood Subdivision, regarding the need for some type of screening between the Topps Discount Center and the adjacent residential development it is recommended by the Planning Board that one of the following types of screening be installed along the South and East property lines of the commercial complex, except for the residential setback on Logan Street.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

1. A 6 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.
2. A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.
3. A 6 ft. high decorative masonry wall.
4. Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the developer with the approval of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-24-66

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board advise City Council that the following resolution was adopted by the Planning Board at its meeting on January 16, 1968:

WHEREAS this Planning Board has recommended the adoption of a Mobile Home Ordinance to Council and,

WHEREAS the Council has referred the matter back to the Planning Board for

further review with a suggestion on the part of Council that Mobile Homes be regulated via the Community Unit Plan approach and

WHEREAS the Planning Board has reconsidered the Ordinance and Council's suggestion,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Planning Board hereby recommends to the Council that Mobile Homes not be permitted or considered under the Community Unit Plan section of the Zoning Code and further that we recommend once again the adoption of the Mobile Home Ordinance as previously recommended with the exception that such uses be restricted to the "D-M-1" district (if and when enacted) and the "D-M" multiple family district and that said Ordinance as previously recommended be so modified to reflect the change as to those zoning districts in which mobile homes would be permitted.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-4-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the flood plain control ordinance as dated January 10 be adopted as follows:

(1) **PURPOSE:**

It is the purpose of the flood plain controls to apply special regulations to the use of land in those areas of the city which are subject to predictable inundations at frequent intervals. Such regulations while permitting reasonable economic use of such properties will help protect the public health and reduce financial burdens imposed on the community, its governmental units and its individuals by frequent and periodic floods and the overflow of lands. Reserve such areas for the impoundment of water to better stabilize stream flow and to better maintain the proper ecological balance. All lands included in such flood plain controls district shall be subject to the terms imposed herein, in addition to the terms imposed by any other zoning use district in which said lands should be located.

(2) **DEFINITIONS:**

- a. Fifty (50) year Frequency Flood: That portion of the flood plain of the Red Cedar River and Sycamore Creek that would be inundated by the limits established for a hypothetical flood having a recurrence frequency of once in about fifty (50) years as determined by the U.S. Corp of Engineers and the Michigan Water Resources Commission.
- b. Flood Plain means the area of land adjoining the channel of a river, stream,

water course, lake or other similar body of water which will be inundated by a flood which can reasonably be expected for that region.

- c. Floodway: That portion of the river bed and flood plain which would be required in the development of an artificial channel to safely pass a flood discharge for a given flood frequency.
- d. Reconstituted 1947 Flood: That portion of the flood plain of the Grand River that would be inundated by a flood of the magnitude of the flood of 1947, as determined by studies of the U.S. Corps of Engineers and the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

(3) **FLOOD PLAIN BOUNDARIES:**

All and lying within the flood plain of the reconstituted 1947 flood of the Grand River and the fifty (50) year frequency flood of the Red Cedar River and Sycamore Creek, is within the flood plain and subject to these regulations, in addition to the regulations otherwise established by the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Lansing. The boundaries of the flood plain are hereby established as shown on the Lansing Flood Plain Map, which accompanies this Ordinance, and which map with all notations, references, and other information shown thereon, shall be as much a part of this Ordinance as if fully described herein. The petitioner for use of the flood plain shall supply such additional topographical data or engineering studies as are needed to define the exact limits of the flood plain, upon the subject land.

Where there is a question as to the exact boundaries and limits of a flood control district, the Lansing City Engineer shall determine the limits from topographical data available to and submitted to him, such information may be reviewed by the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

(4) **USES PERMITTED:**

When the use proposed herein is allowable in a zoning district the following uses and types of activities are permitted in the designated flood plain:

- a. Crop farming and gardening, not including related buildings, except as otherwise provided for in this Ordinance.
- b. Open recreational uses, such as parks, playgrounds, playfields, athletic fields, golf courses, bridle trail and nature paths.
- c. Public rights-of-way, private drives and parking lots.
- d. Public utilities as regulated by the Zoning Ordinance, but not to allow the erection of a building to be used for storage or as a place of employment other than for periodic maintenance, or as provided for in Section (5) a.

- e. For residential districts the flood plain may be used for computing lot area requirements and may, therefore, be used for yard and park areas.
- f. Storage yards for materials and equipment not subject to removal or major damage by flood waters.

(5) USES PERMITTED BY SPECIAL PERMITS:

- a. Any use permitted by right or by special conditions for the zoning district applicable to the land in question, as governed by Chapter 36 of the Lansing Code of Ordinances, provided, however, that the use pattern, and the structures contemplated to accomplish said use shall:
 1. Be so designated as to not reduce the impoundment capacity of the flood plain or significantly reduce the flow of water, by the use of stilts, cantilevering, or such other design techniques which will place the desired buildings above the ground (floodwater) level of the site in a safe manner so that said structure or building will withstand the anticipated velocity of the flood waters, and not suffer damage.
 2. All buildings constructed under said "Special Permits" shall have a minimum floor elevation of not less than three feet above the flood plain level established by this Ordinance, as indicated by the topographical data previously referred to herein and as may be amended from time to time.
 3. Where topographical data, engineering studies or other studies are needed to determine the effects of flooding on a structures and/or the effects of the structure on the flow of water, the applicant shall submit such data or studies. All such data shall be prepared by technically qualified persons.
- b. Dumping or back filling with any material or excavation in manner is prohibited unless.
 1. Through compensating excavation and shaping of the flood plain, the flow and impounding capacity of the flood plain will be maintained or improved, and will not cause an increase in the flood hazard or damage from floods and will not allow water to collect in pools that will stagnate.
 2. No significantly measurable reduction in the flow or impoundment capacity of the flood plain thereby results.
 3. Where there is dumping, back filling or excavation in any manner, adequate site plans and engineering drawings shall be submitted to effectively show the final results of such action.

- c. In a flood plain the construction or location of bridges, outdoor play equipment, bleachers, and similar outdoor equipment and appurtenances, storage of materials or equipment is prohibited unless such elements would not cause any significant obstruction to the flow or reduction in the impoundment capacity of the flood plain and not suffer flood damage.

(6) PROCEDURE FOR SPECIAL PERMIT FOR USE OF THE FLOOD PLAIN:

Request for "Special Permits" for use of the flood plain shall be made in writing with the data required by paragraph (5) a3 and (5) b3 above and filed with the City Clerk in three (3) copies. City Council shall refer such requests to the Planning Board for recommendation and to the Public Service Department for their technical report "and the recommendations of City Engineer, before taking action."

(7) EXISTING USES IN THE FLOOD PLAIN:

It is the intent of this Ordinance to permit existing uses to continue in the flood plain, until they are removed, but not to encourage their survival.

It is recognized there exists within the flood plain as defined by this ordinance, lots and structures which were lawful before their ordinance was passed or amended, which would be prohibited, regulated or restricted under terms of this Ordinance or future amendments.

Such uses are declared by this Ordinance to be incompatible with permitted uses in the flood-plain. It is further the intent of this Ordinance that illegal uses shall not be enlarged upon, expanded or extended, nor be used as grounds for adding other structures or uses prohibited in the flood plain.

Should a structure located in the flood plain, as defined by this Ordinance be destroyed by any means to an extent of more than sixty (60) percent of its replacement cost, exclusive of the foundation at the time of destruction it shall not be reconstructed.

(8) CITY LIABILITY:

The City of Lansing shall incur no liability whatsoever by permitting any use or building within the flood control district.

(9) ENFORCEMENT:

Except where herein otherwise stated, the Building Commissioner shall enforce the provisions of this Ordinance.

Where other provisions of the Code of the City of Lansing, Michigan impose a greater restriction than those proposed for

violation of this Ordinance, the provisions of the more restrictive Ordinance shall be effective.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-23-67

Motion by Black, second by Gaus, that Section 36-15 of the Zoning Code be amended by the addition of the following paragraph:

"Said application is available from the City Clerk's office and shall be completed in the manner described therein. In addition to said application, the applicant is required to file a plot plan which accurately describes the existing and future physical relationship of the building(s) with respect to all lot lines on which it is so situated. Other exhibits as deemed necessary by the Planning Board may be required in addition to the above. It is recommended that the petition form be amended as described herein.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-27-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the proposed addition to the Zoning Code Section 36-25 (a) which provides for a low density multiple development of approximately 12 units per acre be approved.

Mr. Fink expressed reservations in regard to this proposed amendment and also SS-28-67, proposed amendment to Section 36-46 which provides for a maximum lot coverage by a main building not to exceed 35% of which not more than 50% of the vacant area could be used for off-street parking in the "D-M" multiple dwelling district. He stated he would like more time for study and consideration of these two matters.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that SS-27-67 and SS-28-67 be tabled to January 23, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-29-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert, that Section 36-7 of the Zoning Code be amended by deleting from lines 2 and 6 "one acre" and adding item:

(4) that the plan is consistent with the policy plain adopted by the Board and amendments thereto for the sub-

mission review, and development of Community Unit Plans be approved.

Mr. Fink questioned the effect the proposed amendment might have in the downtown core area where density would maybe not be justified under "D" apartment district. What else would be available to a developer of a large apartment unit on perhaps an acre or acre and half of land?

Mr. Nino suggested that perhaps another apartment zone which permits the type of density suggested by Mr. Fink be instigated, if this is the wish of the Board. This could be recommended in the future.

This matter is being given consideration by the Staff in the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Fink stated he was aware of the need for this kind of a density zoning in the immediate downtown core because this will help to generate the revitalization of the downtown area without this kind of density downtown our goals of revitalization of the downtown area might not be realized. Suggested the Staff give serious consideration to this high type of density in the downtown core area.

Mr. Black agreed that there should be a high density district for downtown but did not think it should be under the Community Unit Plan. Concept of Community Unit Plan envisions a fairly large amount of land in which a group of buildings can be related to each other. Would also like to see a serious study made of the high density district for downtown.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Fink, that this matter be tabled to such time as a higher density category is established for the downtown core area.

Motion to table failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—4.

Nays: Black, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—4.

Mr. Fink stated serious consideration should be given this amendment. The apprehension expressed in regard to some downtown developments.

Motion to approve the proposed amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—5.

Nays: Duncan, Fink and Reynolds—3.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the Staff be instructed to consider the feasibility of a higher density zone in the downtown center city core area.

Mr. Fink stated he would like to see the proposed study limited to the center city core as indicated on the Master Land Use Map.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-16-67P Cooley Settlement,

Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Cooley Settlement be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Final plat to be developed with public improvements as required by the Lansing Subdivision Regulations.
2. A right-of-way dedication for Moores River Drive which conforms with that shown on the preliminary plat.
3. All required easements shall be shown on the face of the final plat.
4. This approval shall expire one year from the date of tentative approval by the City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

S-2-67F Delaware Park, Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the final plat of Delaware Park be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the subdivision be developed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.
2. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and Gutter\$ 4,800.00

Monuments 260.00

Gravel 3,000.00

Storm and Sanitary Sewers 25,000.00

Total\$33,060.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-7-67 F Roselawn Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the final plat of Roselawn be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the subdivision be developed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and full street improvements including street paving, curb and gutter, and sidewalks.

2. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and Gutter\$ 5,453.00

Gravel 1,600.00

Storm and Sanitary Sewer 15,950.00

Monument Deposit 160.00

Total\$23,163.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Alan Tubbs, Planning Department Staff, briefly discussed the 1968-74 Capital Improvements Program. He distributed material to the Board for their review prior to a special meeting being called mainly for the discussion of the Capital Improvements Program. This special meeting to be held on January 23, 1968, at 7:30 p.m. Fifth Floor, City Hall.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Guernsey stated he would like to meet with the Finance Committee of the Board for discussion of the 1968-69 Planning Board budget. This meeting is to be arranged later.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The workable Program was distributed to the Board for their perusal. It is a program which has to be submitted to Federal officials each year to review accomplishments and goals of the coming year.

FOREST VIEW COMMUNITY

SS-1-67

Southeast Area Study—Mr. Guernsey reported that a Citizens Advisory Committee is currently being formed on this matter. A meeting regarding same is to be held soon.

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

C/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, January 23, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by
Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Heino, Reynolds
and Siebert—5.

Absent: Duncan, Fink and Gaus—3.

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino that
the minutes of January 2, 1968 be approved
as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Black stated that the next two items
on the agenda SS-27-67 and SS-28-67 were
two items that had been tabled at the pre-
vious Board meeting due to Board members
concern regarding same.

Moved by Black, seconded by Heino, that
the items be taken from the table.

SS-27-67

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino, that
the proposed addition to the Zoning Code
Section 36-25 (a) which provides for a
low density multiple development of ap-
proximately 12 units per acre be approved
to read as follows:

The addition of a lesser density multiple
district to be numbered Section 36-25.1 and
to read as follows:

Section 36.25.1 "D-M:1" Districts—Per-
mitted Uses

In the "D-M.1" districts no building or
land, except as otherwise provided in this
Ordinance shall be erected or used except
for one or more of the following specified
purposes and shall be permitted subject to
the review and approval of the site plan by
the Planning Board. Such review of the
site plan is required to find proper rela-
tionships between the following develop-
ment features as they relate to traffic
safety, and further, to minimize the pos-
sibility of any adverse effects upon adjacent
properties: service roads, driveways, park-
ing areas, accessory buildings and uses,
open space.

Pursuant to the above the following uses
are permitted:

- (1) Any use permitted in the "C" two-
family district.
- (2) Multiple dwellings.
- (3) Group houses.
- (4) More than one structure of the above
types provided the lot or parcel is in
one ownership and said structures
have a yard in common and provided
same is contingent upon an approved
site plan as herein before described.
- (5) Accessory buildings and uses customar-
ily incident to any of the above uses
when located on the same lot and not
involving the conduct of a business in-
cluding servant quarters, private and
storage garages.

The addition of a Section to be numbered
Section 36-25.2 and to read as follows:

Section 36-25.2 Same—Gatherings under
canvas or in open condition.

In any "D-M.1" multiple district, no
show, meeting, entertainment, exhibition,
or religious service of any kind shall be
held under canvas or in the open air unless
there is first filed with the Building Com-
missioner the written consent of the owners
of sixty per cent of all residential property
within a radius of four hundred feet from
the place of such meeting.

The addition of a Section to be numbered
Section 36-25.3 and to read as follows:

Section 36-25.3 Same—Parking area.

Whenever a structure is erected, con-
verted or structurally altered for multiple
dwelling purposes in any "D-M.1" multiple
dwelling district, there shall be provided
accessible parking space on the lot, either
garage or surfaced area, adequate to ac-
commodate two cars for each dwelling unit
provided in the structure.

The addition of a Section to be numbered
Section 36-46.1 and to read as follows:

Section 36-46.1 "D-M.1" District

In the "D-M.1" multiple dwelling dis-
tricts the height of buildings, the minimum

dimension of yards, and the minimum lot area per family shall be as follows:

- (1) Height. In a "D-M.1" multiple dwelling district no building hereafter erected or structurally altered shall exceed three (3) stories or forty-five (45) feet; except as provided in Section 36-54 hereof.
- (2) Rear Yard. There shall be a rear yard having a depth of not less than twenty-five (25) feet for interior lots nor less than fifteen (15) feet for corner lots, except as provided in Section 36-54 hereof.
- (3) Side Yard. On interior lots and for buildings not exceeding two and one-half (2½) stories in height the side yard shall be the same as required in a "C" two family district and this side yard shall be increased by two (2) feet in width for three (3) story buildings. (See Sections 36-54 and 36-7).
- (4) Front Yard. There shall be a front yard having a depth not less than twenty (20) feet to the front line of the building, and not less than twelve (12) feet to the front line of any porch or paved terrace; provided however, where a lot is located at the intersection of two or more streets, there shall be a front yard on each street side of a corner lot, except that the buildable width of such lot shall not be reduced to less than twenty-five (25) feet. No accessory building shall project beyond the front yard line on either street.
- (5) Lot area per family. In the "D-M.1" multiple dwelling district every building hereafter erected or structurally altered for multiple dwelling purposes shall provide a lot area of not less than three thousand (3,000) square feet per family.
- (6) Maximum coverage by main buildings shall not exceed 35% of the total area of the lot on which such main building is situated.
- (7) Not more than 50% of the required vacant area may be used for parking purposes.

Provided, however, where a lot has less area than herein required and was of record at the time of the passage of Ordinance Number 154, such lot may be used for a single family dwelling and the usual accessory buildings. (Ordinance No. 128, p.1, 10/3/66).

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:55 P.M.

Discussion followed regarding the Board's previous action on the amendment to the Zoning Ordinance (SS-29-67) which was approved by the Board at their January 16, 1968 meeting by a 5-3 vote.

Mr. Duncan commented that it is interesting to him that a Board can determine by majority rule a decision that affects action which requires a three-fourths majority, because the discussion related to whether or not five votes were actually enough to allow SS-29-67 to pass. It was the Director's interpretation at that time that because this was not a vote on a Community Unit Plan the six-two voting requirement was not necessary. While this is the action that was taken it still was interesting to me that a body that requires a six-two rule for determining the establishment of a Community Unit Plan can turn right around and alter that plan.

Mr. Black stated that there has been so much discussion on whether we need six votes or five votes, that this should certainly be clarified. There are many cases in various kinds of deliberations by public bodies where more than a simple majority is necessary to pass something. Since the basic concept of planning is that when you adopt a city plan or a zoning ordinance you normally do it by more than a majority. The idea is that a lot of people have to be in favor of it in order to adopt the ordinance in the first place. Once adopted then more than a majority have to be in favor of changing it. I think there is a certain validity in zoning Ordinance changes to require more than a majority to make the change. This is part of the basic rule not necessarily Planning Board rules.

Mr. Duncan stated that the seriousness of decision making definite demands that some considerations be made regarding the number of people that support or do not support. But the rules by the same token, should have the same serious considerations.

A decision from the City Attorney has been requested regarding the matter of the required number of votes to pass an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance.

Motion by Black, seconded by Heino, that the motion to approve the preceding amendment (SS-27-67) approved as follows:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-28-67

Motion by Black, supported by Siebert, that an amendment to Section 36-46 of the Zoning Code be amended as follows:

Amend Section 36-46 by adding the following thereto:

- (6) Maximum lot coverage by main buildings shall not exceed 35%.
- (7) Not more than 50% of the vacant space may be used for parking purposes.

Also delete last paragraph of this section, namely:

Provided however, where a lot has less area than herein required and was of record at the time of the passage of Ordinance Number 164, such lot may be used for a single family dwelling and the usual accessory buildings.

Mr. Duncan asked that the following comment regarding SS-27-67 and SS-28-67 be on record in the minutes:

"In a sense both SS-27-67 and SS-28-67 are much more meaningful if SS-29-67 is passed. If SS-29-67 is not passed, then they are not as meaningful. In light of that, I think my previous relative to decision making regarding regulations are pertinent and would therefore like to have those included as indicative of a dissenting yes. In other words, you don't take away the opportunity to provide construction of a specific type as was the case with SS-29-67 until you include some vehicle to enable that. Unless there has been careful consideration relative to the merits of that decision, and I don't believe we made this careful consideration in the decision making process that followed at the last Board meeting."

Mr. Black stated he was confused and did not follow Mr. Duncan's comments. He understood SS-29-67 was adopted last week. What you said was that you thought the adoption of SS-28-67 ought to be contingent on whether or not we adopted SS-29-67.

The matter was further discussed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

The Director reported that the Finance Committee of the Planning Board had reviewed the proposed 1968-69 budget. Also reviewed budget from now to end of fiscal and a supplemental budget request for real location of funds to part time help account. Transfer from salary account is suggested to provide these funds. Also need funds transferred to office equipment account for additional filing equipment.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that \$3,000 be transferred from Salary Account No. 170110 to part time help account No. 170122, and that \$200 be transferred from Salary Account No. 170110 to Office Equipment Account No. 170440.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

The Director discussed the proposed 1968-69 budget. He stated that the salaries of

the Community Renewal Program Staff were included in the budget. He explained budget requests in each account.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Siebert, that an increase of \$500 be provided in the Director's salary.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Fink arrived at 8:15 P.M.

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that the proposed budget as submitted by the Director with the exception in the adjustment in the Director's salary and the approved transfers be recommended to the City Council and Mayor.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Recess from 8:30 to 8:50 P.M.

Z-214-65

Motion by Fink, supported by Reynolds, that the Board reconsider the petition by William McCurdy to rezone property at 3821 Moores River Drive, from "A-1" family district to Community Unit Plan. Action taken at the January 16, 1968 meeting of the Board failed due to a 5-3 vote on the recommended approval of the petition.

Mr. Black questioned the reason for the motion to reconsider the subject petition.

Mr. Fink replied that he has considered this petition on the basis of what is good for the Community as he sees it, and from the standpoint that planned street development in this area might possibly be delayed. Think it best to at least forward this plan to City Council for their action.

Mr. Black reiterated his feelings on this matter in regard to the hazardous traffic situation at the intersection of Mr. Hope and Moores River Drive. There has been no assurance from any Board or other source that there would not be additional traffic problems as a result of this request.

Discussion followed on the proposed widening of Moores River Drive.

Motion to reconsider the petition carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Black—1.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition by William McCurdy to rezone property at 3881 Moores River Drive from "A-1" family district to Community Unit Plan be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The site plan and landscape plan, as approved, be adhered to.
 - a. Parking shall be 2.0 spaces per unit.
 - b. The total number of units shall not exceed 14—to consist of one 12 unit dwelling and one two dwelling unit.
 - c. The house shall be bricked to conform to the style of the apartment building.
 - d. That the landscape plan be adhered to, and fencing be provided along the North and East lines of the property. Type of fencing is subject to approval of the Planning Department.
2. That the land be platted in conformance with the plans for Moores River Drive.
3. The approval shall be for a period of one year. No occupancy permits shall be issued until the final plat is recorded.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Nays: Black—1.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Alan Tubbs discussed the general background of the Capital Improvements Program. The Program is provided for in the State Act No. 285, Public Acts of 1931 and as amended, and in the Lansing City Charter which states that the Planning Board in collaboration with other Officers and Boards of the City shall prepare its recommendations for a Program for Capital Improvements expenditures of public structures and improvements for the ensuing six years and submit the same to the Mayor and Council, not later than the first day of February of each year. It also sets forth that the proposed improvements listed in such program shall be set forth for each year in the general order of their priority and recommendations shall be made for the financing thereof.

The projects within the program are based upon the Mayor's policy guidelines which are as follows:

1. To provide the capital improvements needed to encourage and maintain a balanced growth in Lansing. The program was to include improvements to revitalize and renew the Central City to rehabilitate and conserve the older inner city, and to provide basic services

to allow orderly growth on the city's fringe.

2. To be careful in programming and setting priorities of individual projects in order of their importance.
3. To continue to utilize Federal and State programs where feasible to assist in the financing of needed improvements.

It is the Mayor's intention to establish an improvement review committee which will meet quarterly to evaluate the progress of budgeted improvements within each department. The proposed program was prepared by the Mayor's CIP Committee working with the Planning Staff. The Capital Improvements Committee of the Planning Board has reviewed the policy and individual projects within the six year program, and also the financial situation in detail came to the conclusion that the present revenue base is insufficient to maintain an adequate Capital Improvements Program. Over 200 projects were reviewed for consideration this year.

The total program costs are approximately eighty two million dollars. Mr. Tubbs proceeded to discuss a breakdown of these total program costs which would leave a balance of approximately thirty eight million six hundred thousand dollars as the city six year costs. He then gave a breakdown of the city six year costs and recommended financing. He stated that the cost figures are essentially the same as the six year program recommended to the Planning Board by the Mayor's Capital Improvements Technical Coordinating Committee with the exceptions of two projects listed under the Parks and Recreation Program which the Capital Improvements Committee of the Board are not recommending.

Three major points for discussion:

1. The individual projects contained in the program.
2. Discussion of revenue and expenditure projections of the City for the next six years.
3. A formal recommendation of the Board on the program and the method of financing.

Mr. Heino, Chairman of the Capital Improvements Committee of the Board, discussed the two exceptions in the Committee's recommendation under the Parks and Recreation Program.

Mr. Heino read the Committee's recommendation to the Board as follows:

The Capital Improvements Committee of the Planning Board recommends that the projects contained in the six year program be approved with the following exceptions:

1. Parks and Recreation Project 74, Michigan Ski Hill.
2. Parks and Recreation Project 13-78 Evergreen Cemetery Storm Sewer. The

Committee withholds a recommendation on methods of financing until there has been discussion of the financial situation with the entire Board.

Mr. Black asked the total cost of the two exceptions and Mr. Heino replied approximately one hundred and five thousand dollars.

Mr. Black questioned if there were items under the Public Service Department which might be deferred for a while since streets improvements consumes a large share of the proposed costs.

Mr. Tubbs pointed out that the city's cost over six years in this regard is only four million. The I-496 Expressway accounts for the height of proposed costs.

Mr. Tubbs discussed in depth the financial situation. He distributed material showing seven alternatives with pros and cons of each method of recommending financing.

Mr. Black asked how much the proposed budget would have to be reduced in order not to have to recommend additional taxes, and also an estimated date of Mr. Gervais Traffic Survey which might possibly have an effect as to recommendation on street improvements in the Central City area?

Mr. Tubbs replied that if revenues are not increased, without a severe cut in operating expenses, there would be no funds available to finance any of the improvements contained in the program. For four years the Planning Board has suggested this situation would take place and we have arrived at that point in time where the present revenue available to city government are not sufficient to maintain our present level of operating expense and undertake a Capital Improvement Program. This is due to a number of factors: Inflation, cost of operating city government, costs of services and salaries, Capital Improvement Program items have more than doubled in costs.

He proceeded to discuss trends in property tax distribution by political unit. Distributed charts showing trends in general fund budget, Trend Act 51 fund budget.

Results and conclusions of the Citizens Advisory Committee on fiscal reform of 1966 were discussed with the Board.

At this point each of the seven alternatives of recommended financing were discussed in greater detail.

Motion by Heino, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the projects contained within the six year Capital Improvements Program be approved with the following exceptions:

1. Parks and Recreation Project 74. Michigan Ski Hill. The Board does not recommend the second phase of the program scheduled for 1969, for this six year program. The Board does not believe that such an investment in a seasonal facility is needed at this time and suggests that perhaps the funds could be spent to improve park facilities in established neighborhoods throughout the City.
2. Parks and Recreation Project 13-78. Evergreen Cemetery, Storm Sewer. The Board does not believe that future cemetery development should be subsidized from the general fund. An investigation of the prices of City Lots in relation to private cemetery lots in the area suggested and if feasible, that the price of City Lots be increased to provide sufficient funds for future maintenance and development costs.

The Board recommends that the general fund projects contained in the six year Capital Improvements Program be financed from a 1% income tax on residents and a $\frac{1}{2}$ % tax on non-residents instead of further increases in the property tax.

The Board further recommends that some consideration be given to those residents living on a limited or fixed income. It is the belief of the Board that reduction in the property tax millage rate should be left to the discretion of the City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 20, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:48 p.m. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—5.

Absent: Duncan, Heino, Siebert—3.

PUBLIC HEARING PROCEDURE

Mr. Ronald F. Nino, Planning Department staff, stated that since the notification process has become such an issue at recent Board meetings, the staff has rethought the whole notification process. Notification on rezoning petitions is not required. However, it is our opinion, due to the Board's desire to gain all information possible relative to rezoning petitions, that it is highly desirable to notify by mail those property owners within a defined area of a zoning petition. The staff would like to recommend to the Board that they adopt a policy whereby everyone within 300 ft. of every zoning petition be notified by mail of the public hearing before the Planning Board. The advertisement in the newspaper does not seem to accomplish its purpose. Consideration of the proposed policy of notification of persons within 300 ft. of each rezoning petition is therefore submitted for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Reynolds commented regarding persons buying homes on contracts where the deed is in the original owner's name, and to be sure to send the notice to the right persons.

Mr. Nino stated that those persons last appearing on the revised assessment rolls are the ones notified. This notification problem has arisen from the fact that on community unit plans, notices are sent to those within 300 ft. of the subject property. On rezonings we have been sending notices of the public hearing to abutting property owners most affected by the proposed rezoning. An established policy is definitely necessary.

Mr. Black agreed with the necessity of an established policy regarding this matter. He asked what kind of mail is suggested for the notification?

Discussion followed on types of mail delivery and costs involved.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that the advertisement of public hearing in the newspaper be simplified. Also that perhaps the subject property should be posted regarding the public hearing before the Planning Board.

Motion by Black seconded by Fink that this matter be referred to the Executive Committee for their recommendation and report at the March 19, 1968 meeting of the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Recess from 8:00 to 9:05 p.m.

SS-24-67 Shopping Center Study Report No. 2

Report No. 2 of the Shopping Center Study has previously been distributed to the Board. Mr. Guernsey stated that it provides a background of different trends in terms of commercial movements. It is a review of commercial standards. Ultimately this will lead to a Master Plan revision in the commercial section.

MODEL CITIES

Mr. Edwin P. Brown, Assistant Planning Director, discussed the second application for a Model Cities planning grant. He stated the Board was welcome to attend committee meetings. The Mayor has asked that agencies that intend to aid in the Model Cities application preparation submit a resolution to that effect. Mr. Brown reported the activity to date on the application. Discussion followed regarding the ten task force committees of citizen participation.

The Director commented in regard to staff shortages in the Community Renewal Division. A Planning staff member is taking over the Citizens Advisory Committee function. Also two of the Planning staff are working on the Urban Renewal No. 2 project. The staff is almost totally

committed, on various projects. Additional staff has been hired to work on the Model Cities application, which has very high priority. A resource group has been established at Michigan State University from the School of Social Science, which will act as an aid to the staff in the final writing of the application, and also in citizen participation and coordination with the various groups. Discussion followed the city's commitment in regard to the Model Cities application and the importance of following through in this area.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds that the following resolution be adopted as Board policy regarding the Demonstration Cities Program:

WHEREAS the Planning Board of the City of Lansing recognizes the intent of the Demonstration Cities Program to rebuild or revitalize large slum and blighted areas and generally improve education and living conditions for the people in such areas; and

WHEREAS as it is clear that implementations of the Program should be in accordance with and as projected in the Comprehensive Master Plan of the City of Lansing; and

WHEREAS the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to make grants to, and contract with City Demonstration Agencies to pay 80 percent of the costs of planning and developing such city demonstration programs;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Planning Board of Lansing, Michigan:

1. To support the intent of the Demonstration Cities Program and Lansing's application for financial assistance for the planning and development of a comprehensive city demonstration program;
2. To provide insofar as possible administrative and technical guidance and co-operation in the preparation of the application and the development of the plan.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

PLANNING DEPARTMENT WORK PROGRAM

The Director introduced the Planning

Department's Work Program approach which he described as a management tool to achieve the maximum quality and quantity that the Board and Department are able to produce with authorized staff and budget. This approach calls for a re-examination of objectives, and the best way to do this is to look at our legal responsibilities, assess our past performance, project future needs, and then reset objectives. The Board proceeded with a consideration of legal responsibilities and a checklist covering public works, subdivisions, publicity, presentation, public hearings, zoning, and the role of local government.

Discussion followed.

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY RENEWAL RESOLUTION

Motion by Black supported by Fink that the Planning Board support the Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Renewal in their recommendation to City Council of February 9, 1968 which read as follows:

"The Lansing Citizens Advisory Committee on Community Renewal recommends to the City Council that it consider as soon as possible the December CAC recommendation that a demonstration residential rehabilitation program be developed for one block or several blocks; that the City Council accept the offer of the Lansing Home Builders Association, as set forth in its letter to the CAC, and that Council welcome offers of other groups and public agencies to lend their support to a project which would improve the physical and social conditions of a selected area on a cooperative basis with the residents of the designated area."

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

A letter from the Metropolitan Lansing Fine Arts Council of February 8, 1968 inviting Board members to attend a luncheon on February 29, 1968 to take part in a dialogue with the arts. Received and placed on file.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 p.m.

C

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, February 6, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:35 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—6.

Absent: Duncan and Fink—2.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Z-163-67

Mr. C. Warner Baxter, 3418 Forest Road, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3418 Forest Road from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Baxter stated that a possible sale of the property was pending at this time and asked that a decision on this matter be deferred until March.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:42 P.M.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-1-68

Mr. Ben Wickens, 2886 Crestwood Drive, East Lansing, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3111 Aurelius Road, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family district. He stated he wishes to erect a duplex on the site, and that the one family home on the site had been demolished.

Mr. Fink arrived at 7:47 P.M.

Mr. Wickens was questioned regarding the type of building he planned to erect

and he replied it would probably be a ranch type duplex.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-2-68

This is a petition to rezone property at 5900 block S. Washington Avenue from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple district.

Mr. Fountain, planning staff, stated the original petition was for "D-M" multiple but has since been amended to request Community Unit Plan. He discussed the location, size, and zoning in the vicinity of the proposal.

He explained the proposed development under the Community Unit Plan.

Mr. Nino stated that since the petition had been amended to Community Unit Plan and the notification procedures vary, another hearing would be required for this petition. Stated the applicant was probably not present since it had been indicated to him that a formal hearing would not be held on this matter and that his presence might not be necessary.

Mr. Black questioned if those persons interested in this matter had been informed of the Community Unit Amendment, that he had not been aware of it until now. He was informed that the amendment came in too late to notify property owners.

Due to the number of persons present interested in this matter, a pole of the Board Members was taken for their opinion on hearing the petition at this time.

Discussion followed relative to holding the hearing for the benefit of those present, even though the developer was not present. Motion by Fink, supported by Duncan, that a tentative hearing be held at this time.

Mr. Black withdrew his objections in view of the obvious desire of the Board to hear those persons present, but stated that he thought the Staff handled this situ-

ation very poorly, and they should be reprimanded. It is an imposition on the Board to have to take time tonight to hear this and to take time two weeks from tonight to do it over. Staff should be soundly reprimanded for their procedure in this matter.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Gaus—1.

David Crissey, 5904 Keyes Road, spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment. He objected because the area is largely single family residential with few exceptions, possible degrading or reduction of property values, schools would be overburdened. Stated that the subject property definitely needed to be developed but with single family homes not multiple dwellings. Indicated he was informed 28 days ago over the phone when he called the Planning Department regarding this matter of the amendment to Community Unit Plan.

Robert Pohl, 5922 Kyes Road, questioned if property owners would be contacted regarding the public hearing on the community unit amendment to this petition. This was affirmed. Petition of 51 property owners signed petition in opposition to this proposed amendment.

James Burnett, 6008 Keyes Road, property owner abutting proposed development stated he was not notified on proposed rezoning. Mr. Nino stated that to the best of his knowledge abutting property owners were notified of rezoning. Names are obtained at Assessor's Office.

Discussion followed on notification procedures.

Jack Kineman, 5729 S. Washington Avenue, not within 300 ft. used as criteria for notification procedures, but very much concerned with this matter. Concerned over school situation in this area, and stated he thought there were enough multiple developments in the area.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that a public hearing be held on Z-2-68 for the rezoning of property at 5900 block S. Washington Avenue from "A-1" family to Community Unit Plan, on March 5, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-3-68

Mr. Mitch Skory, 1906 E. Miller Road, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 901-905 Cleveland Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district. He stated he wished to connect the TV Shop and single family structure presently on the property to expand his TV Sales

and Service. Has been trying to rezone the property for about a year and a half and has been denied due mostly to Oakland Street widening uncertainties.

Mr. Fink asked for a sketch of the proposed changes and Mr. Skory replied he has submitted one which is currently on file.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-4-68

Bob Kimpton, 2222 River Court, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5300 S. Cedar Street, from "J" parking district to "F" commercial district. He spoke regarding the need for identification sign. Sign will be well constructed and attractive.

Mr. Reynolds questioned whether the appliance store was part of the Jolly Cedar Center and if their requested sign could be included on the main shopping center sign. Mr. Kimpton replied that they had no connection with the shopping center itself.

Mr. Van Houten, Van Houten Sign Company, submitted pictures showing the difficulty in seeing the building until very close to it, and spoke in regard to the need for the identification sign, and type of sign proposed.

No one spoke in opposition to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-5-68

Mr. Rodney Colby, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1215 E. Jolly Road, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family district. He stated he wished to erect a duplex on the subject property. Thought it would improve the neighborhood. He described land use in the neighborhood.

Mr. Arthur Kowalk, 5019 Devonshire, questioned the type of proposed building. Plans of the building were shown to him. He stated he had in his possession some deed restrictions which were made up when subdivision was developed. He asked if they applied in this case. Mr. Nino referred Mr. Kowalk to his attorney for a clarification of this matter. Discussion followed regarding the deed restriction. Mr. Kowalk was asked to advise the Staff of any deed restrictions which might pertain to the subject property.

Mr. Hanes, 5009 Devonshire, questioned whether the proposed duplex would face

Jolly Road or Devonshire. Mr. Fountain stated he believed the proposed would face Jolly Road. Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-6-68

Mr. Patrick Eyde, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the southwest corner of Main and Washington, from "C-2" family and "D-M" multiple to "G" business district. Mr. Eyde stated they wish to erect a motor hotel with bar and restaurant facilities. They have a feasibility study which shows the necessity for this facility. Plan to build whatever the property is capable of handling, which will also be determined by study. Plan to turn this facility into a convention center.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-7-68

Petition is to rezone property at 1021 Moores River Drive, from "B-1" family to "D-1" professional district.

Mr. William Roble, 1315 S. Logan Street, did not think it was feasible to have professional property on this site due to the traffic situation on Logan Street. Thought the property should remain residential.

Mr. Brown, 1005 Moores River Drive, also spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Plans of the proposed professional building were shown to those speaking in objection.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-10-68

Mr. Kentner, 2504 Park Street, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2506 North Grand River Avenue, from "A-1" and "J" parking, and "H" light industry to "H" light industry. Mr. Kentner stated they wish the rezoning for disposal of this property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-11-68

Charles Jacobs, 1006½ Jerome, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1006 Jerome Street, from "D-M" mul-

tipale to "F" commercial. Mr. Jacobs stated the property has been used commercial for a long time as a textbook and school supply store supplying Eastern High School. He wishes to bring the present non-conforming use of the building and land into conformance and to permit needed alterations to the building. Spoke in regard to need for more space.

Mr. Nino questioned the adequacy of parking.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-12-68

Mr. Kirkpatrick, 742 Merrill Street, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1933 N. Larch, from "J" parking to "F" commercial. He stated they wished to add 20 ft. to the entire south side of the present laundry building. A sketch showing the proposed parking layout was shown to the Board.

Dr. Chaplin read letter on behalf of himself and Mr. James Light in opposition to the proposed amendment. Received and placed on file.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-13-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 722 N. Logan Street, from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-14-68

Mr. Carl Kessler, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5100 S. Logan Street, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial. Mr. Kessler described the adjacent land use and stated that the requested rezoning, which would permit the construction and operation of a restaurant, would be provided with access from an easement through the shopping center adjacent to the subject site.

Mr. Black questioned whether the parking would be on their own site or on the adjacent shopping center, and Mr. Kessler replied they have adequate parking on their property.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-15-68

Mr. Stuart Dunnings, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1801 W. Main Street, from "E-2" drive-in to "F" commercial district.

He stated there was a vacant gasoline station on the site and the petitioner proposed to operate a ice cream drive-in eating store and neighborhood package grocery store. Complete remodeling is planned for present structure.

Mr. Charles Millar, 817 Everett Street, asked for more details regarding the proposed rezoning. Also stated his concern in that the proposal is across the street from a school. He objected strongly to the proposal. A plan of the proposal was shown to Mr. Millar.

Mr. Black asked what the Master Plan proposed for the area and was informed by Mr. Fountain that industrial is planned in the future.

Mr. Clarence Taylor, Jr., stated he had not been notified of the proposed amendment. Asked for a clarification of the Board's notification procedure which was given by Mr. Nino. He then stated his concern in regard to the safety of the school children and his desire to keep the neighborhood residential in use.

Ike Crompton, 813 Everett Drive, objected to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-16-68

Mr. Ken Finch, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2712 Aurelius Road, from "A-1" residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling district

Mr. Finch submitted site plans and pictures of the proposed development of multiple rental units. He stated that the Master Plan, proposes the area for medium density dwellings. Fifteen units proposed with parking for 36 cars.

Mr. Richard Fiser, 1909 E. Willard, questioned the subject property being in the flood plain and thought the sewer situation was inadequate.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-17-68

Mr. Donald Fox, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 600 W. Shiawassee Street, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district. The petitioner wishes to use the property for professional offices, since a clinic and apartment building is presently under con-

struction to the immediate west of this site.

Mr. Bond, 419 North Pine Street, stated that the entire block should be considered for rezoning.

Mr. Lipa, 609 W. Shiawassee Street, spoke in support of the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-18-68

Mr. Paul Younger, 1212 S. Genesee Drive, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2200 S. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "J" parking district. He stated that the subject property is now being used for new car sales and service. The purpose of the petition is to rezone the west end of the property in order for owner to have space to park automobiles until he can sell them. Under the present situation he does not have adequate space around his building or behind it. Cited land use in the area.

Mr. Stanaway, 320 Riley Street, submitted letters from Mrs. Josephine M. Davis, 225 Riley, Mrs. Bill Riddle, 307 Riley, in objection to the proposed amendment.

A letter was also received from Mrs. Erwin Johnson, 311 Riley, in objection.

Mr. Stanaway submitted pictures showing the adverse conditions of the subject property. He also commented in regards to a letter from the Building Department requesting the owner of the car lot to clean up the premises. Mr. Stanaway objected strongly to the proposed amendment.

George Whitmore, 308 Riley, Robert and Kathy Fox, 314 Riley, Margaret Webster, 310 Riley, all spoke in opposition of the proposed amendment

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-19-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 5134 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

P-1-68

Sunset Hills No. 7, Preliminary Plat

Gregory Main discussed the location, size, and proposed development. He stated

that the plat is concerned with the flood plain and will therefore have to be referred to the Michigan Water Resources Commission.

Mr. Francis Fine, Developer, stated that the homes proposed would be built above the flood plain line. Southern portion of lots on the river is preferred to be part of each individual property owner's lot.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

RE: Z-149-67

Mr. Claude Fiser spoke in regards to the petition to rezone property at 2800, 2900, 3000 blocks Aurelius Road and Ruth, from "A-1" family to Community Unit Plan, being in the flood plain.

Discussion followed.

Recess from 10:10 to 10:55 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARINGS SET

Z-8-68

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that the public hearing to rezone property at 5900 Block S. Washington Avenue, from "A-1" family district to Community Unit Plan be held on March 5, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-9-68

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that the public hearing to rezone property at 3200-3300 North Larch, from "A-1" family district to Community Unit Plan be held on March 5, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the minutes of January 16, 1968 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-149-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that a Community Unit Plan be invited on the property known as 2800, 2900, 3000 block Aurelius Road and Ruth Avenue which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.

2. That the applicant work out details of housing types, and site plan standards with the Planning Department and Water Resources Commission.

3. That the property be filed so as not to be affected by flooding. Final grade plans be filed prior to issuance of building permits reflecting this condition.

4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans, the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Mr. Fink spoke regarding his concern for those persons in the area who do not is recommended by the Board for the subject property.

Discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-157-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by 20th Century Builders, Inc., to rezone a parcel at 4400 block N. Grand River, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district be denied.

Zoning attempts to locate the various uses of land in some form of relationship to each other and in relation to all transportation facilities, utilities, and public facilities and services. Zoning assumes that land differs as to the use for which it is best suited based on its relationship to other use, physical features, and facilities available.

The site in question was given this consideration when rezoned to "D-M" multiple. The present zoning provides for a proper transition between North Grand River Avenue and the single family residential development to the South.

The Board believes that the change as requested would be an intrusion of the established residential district, and could possibly be used as justification for future changes in the area for non-residential use of a more intense nature.

It should be further pointed out that the applicant of this request developed the apartment complex to the West which does not have provisions for adequate off-street parking.

It would seem in the best interest of all concerned that the lot in question be considered for providing relief for this overflow.

The Board believes the present zoning allows reasonable use of, and permits development compatible with the area.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-158-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 3325 E Michigan Avenue, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional be tabled to March 5, 1968 to enable further study and coordination with the East Lansing Planning Department.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-159-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Louis J. Hufnagel, to rezone a parcel at 800 W. Mt. Hope, from "J" parking and "F" commercial district to "F" commercial, be denied as filed and the property described as Lot 15 Floral Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, and recommends that portion of the property described as:

Commencing 5 ft. East and 7 ft. North of the Southwest corner of Lot 15, thence North 66 ft., thence East 25 ft., thence North 22 ft., thence West 28 ft. thence South 88 ft., thence East 3 ft. to point of beginning

be rezoned from "J" parking district to "F" commercial district.

Due to the established land use on the property the Board does not believe the recommended change will adversely affect the adjacent properties on the general welfare.

Screening to be provided along the North and West property lines, except for the residential set-backs on Mt. Hope Avenue and Rundle Avenue. Screening to be as required by the Planning Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-160-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, attorney, acting for Dom Verderese, to rezone parcels at 2900 block Maloney, 2200 Dunlap, and 2900 block Pleasant Grove Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

One purpose of zoning is to secure a reasonable development pattern by keeping similar and related uses together and separating dissimilar and unrelated uses.

The site under consideration is located within an area that is zoned and developed in single family homes. The change of zoning would introduce a different land use intensity into the area accompanied by an increase of traffic and activity. The change may then adversely affect property values in the vicinity and may therefore deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with the existing regulations.

It was found through previous investigation on the property to the Northwest (Z-124-67) that sewers in the area were designed and installed for low density residential development as does the Master Plan depict for this area. Further in connection with Z-124-67 it was ascertained that the schools are crowded and site size does not permit extension.

With a minimum effort and coordination between the property owners in the vicinity it would be possible to achieve full development of the land in accord with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-161-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Hazen and Edith Everett, by Walter Neller Company, Agent, to rezone a parcel at Willard Street, between Cedar Street and Maplewood Avenue, from "A-1" family to "D" apartment be granted.

The Board considered the existing and potential development of the area, and it was the consensus of opinion that the proposed change would act as a transition zone between the development along South Cedar Street and the single family residential to the West. It was further pointed out that the site has ease of access to a major street (Cedar Street), and commercial facilities are close by.

The Board further recommended that the property to the East be considered for "D-1" professional zoning, and that the matter be placed on their agenda March 5, 1968 for a public hearing.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-162-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Jon Anthony, to rezone a parcel at 2208 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district, be denied.

The site under consideration is located within an area that is proposed for industrial as indicated on the Master Land Use Plan with the exception of the direct frontage on Grand River Avenue, which is intended to be reserved as open space and act as a transition zone between the potential industrial area and the existing single family development to the South.

If and when land is zoned for industry, which the land North of this site is, it should be protected from the encroachment of non-industrial uses.

The change as requested would by no means provide for a transitional land use, it would encourage further strip commercial development along this area of North Grand River, accompanied by an increase of traffic and activity, signs, and many other adverse influences that follow strip commercial development. This then would deter the improvement and development of the property on the South side of Grand River Avenue, and place higher demands for further commercial zoning and development which would eventually create an inharmonious mixture of land use development.

The parcel West of this site was zoned commercial, but was intended as a relief measure for an existing commercial use and not to encourage further strip commercial zoning in the area, which is many times misconstrued by developers and property owners.

It should be further pointed out that this change would not only facilitate the expansion of the flower shop as proposed, but could allow for the development of additional commercial uses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-164-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William A. Gill, to rezone a parcel at 1021-1023 N. Logan Street, property described as Lot 5 and the North 24 ft. of Lot 6, Kunder Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, be denied as filed, and that portion of the property described as:

The North 32 ft. of the South 35 ft. of the East 55 ft.

be rezoned from "B-1" family residential to "F" commercial and

The balance of the property

be rezoned from "B-1" family residential to "J" parking district.

Screening to be provided along the South and West property lines except for the residential set-back on Logan and Maple Street. Screening to be as required by the Planning Board.

The Board does not believe this change in zoning will encourage expansion to a degree that the surrounding property will be adversely affected.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-165-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Marjorie Holmgren, to rezone a parcel at 5826 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" family to "D-M" or "G" district be denied.

The neighborhood in which the subject property is located was subdivided in a very haphazard manner. The varying size of the lots, the discontinuity of the street system, and the lack of public services all contribute to the spotty development of the area.

The development which has occurred in the immediate vicinity of the subject property is rated as conservable by the Community Renewal Program.

If the subject property were zoned to a high density residential or commercial use development could not occur in any reasonable manner unless additional outlets to either Hughes or Valencia Street were secured.

Public Service is not available and is not expected in the immediate future.

The Master Plan proposes continuation of the established single family land use pattern.

It is the opinion of the Board that the numerous lots in the area makes assembly and replat of much of the area a real possibility however, and in no case should any large scale development occur prior to the installation of public utilities.

The South Logan Zoning Policy also indicates residential development for the subject property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-166-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, attorney, acting for Delto Inc., to rezone a parcel in the 5300 block S. Cedar St., from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

The site under consideration is located at the southern end of the Jolly-Cedar Shopping Complex. The entire complex is zoned "F" commercial and "J" parking. The "J" parking district extends approximately 178 ft. West of South Cedar Street and provides for adequate off-street parking and setback.

The applicant has proposed a pole mounted sign with a total area of approximately 187 square feet.

The Southern portion of this shopping complex has been divided off and is being developed. It is quite possible with each new development a request for a sign adjacent to the street right-of-way will be requested.

Adequate setbacks for off-street and aesthetic qualities have been assured, and the location of any signs within this setback should be given careful consideration.

The indiscriminate placing of advertising signs will negate the aesthetic values built into the area and generally contribute to the chaotic confusing situation prevalent on most commercially developed streets.

The Board believes that if the sign proposed is located on or as close as possible to the building development, a precedent will be established, which will promote a more aesthetically pleasing commercial district.

It should be further pointed out that other requests of this nature have been considered North of this site by both the Planning Board and Board of Zoning Appeals, and in each case were discouraged.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-167-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Frank Basel, to rezone a parcel at 1415 E. Grand River, from "B-1" family to "G" business district be denied.

The site under consideration is located within an area that is zoned and developed in single family homes. Existing development of that portion of the property that fronts Grand River Avenue lacks the area necessary for off-street parking, screening of adjacent properties, and in general creates an incompatible land use relationship.

The Board believes that based on the existing land use in the vicinity, and factors pertaining to the site. (lack of off-street parking, screening of adjacent properties, over development of the site) that this type of operation should not be encouraged to expand. The expansion of this development would compound the existing problems that exist, and further penetrate into the existing residential development.

The Community Renewal survey indicates major rehabilitation for this area, and the Master Land Use Plan indicates residential development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-168-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Doyle and Smith, attorneys, acting for Mr. and Mrs. J. Murphy, to rezone a parcel at 903 N. Grand River Avenue, from "E-2" drive-in district to "G-2" district amended to "H" light industrial district January 30, 1968 be denied.

With respect to the proposed use, the Board is of the opinion that it is as unwarranted at this location at the present time as it was in 1960 when a nearly identical petition was considered by the Planning Board and City Council.

The proposed industrial use of this property would be completely contrary to the existing land use and future land use plan.

Service stations when located in industrial districts are usually characterized by large number of cars in various states of disrepair being stored at the rear and sides of the building. When the station is located near or adjacent to a residential district the station can become a source of blight and a deterrent to the improvement or development of the adjacent property.

There are several sites, zoned to accommodate the proposed use, which are as yet undeveloped. It should be further pointed out that the existing zoning on the site allows use of the property as a service station.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-169-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, attorney, acting for Warner & Long Development Company, to rezone a parcel at 3328 W. Jolly Road, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The Planning Board and City Council considered a petition for rezoning of this property from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple in March, 1967. The Planning Board found that "C-2" family zoning allowed reasonable use of the property, with minimal adverse affect on the adjacent single family residential development. The City Council concurred in the Planning Board's recommendation and rezoned the property "C-2" family (Z-184-66). The Planning Board again considered a request in July 1967 to change the zoning from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple district and could not find where conditions had changed which would justify a zoning amendment, and recommended to City Council that the request be denied. The City Council concurred in the Planning Board's recommendation September 5, 1967 (Z-57-67).

The Board cannot find where conditions have changed regarding this property and urge the Planning Board to reaffirm their previous action.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-170-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dave Connelly, to rezone a parcel at 311 N. Logan, 313 N. Logan and 1114 W. Ionia Street, from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied.

The site under consideration is located within a block that is zoned single family and developed with single family homes with the exception of a two-family to the North and a two-family to the South.

The requested change would promote development out of character with the existing development in the vicinity. The one-way traffic pattern in the area is such that if ingress and egress to the site were proposed from Ionia Street it would increase the amount of traffic and activity through the residential neighborhood West of Logan Street.

Sewers that serve this area are combined storm and sanitary. Plans are to install separate sewers which would prohibit raw sewage from emptying into the river at times of peak storm water runoff. One would assume from this that an increase in density in this area would compound the problems at this time.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Z-7-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo A. Farhat, acting for PAC Advertising, to rezone a parcel at 1021 Moores River Drive, from "B" one family to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The property was the subject of an identical petition which was denied by the City Council on November 13, 1967. The Board has reviewed this petition and can find no reason for reconsideration. The previous analysis and recommendation, which examined the existing land use, the future land use plan, and the probable effect of the reconstruction of Logan Street as a boulevard on the property fronting Logan, is in our opinion still valid.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-13-67P Vercruysse Subdivision

Amendment to Preliminary Plat.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the request by Phillip G. Vercruysse, to amend the preliminary plat of Vercruysse Subdivision to provide seven lots rather than six lots be approved subject to all of the previous conditions of approval.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8

Nays: None.

P-1-68 Sunset Hill No. 7, Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Sunset Hills No. 7, be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
2. The Haze drain easement shall be shown on the face of the final plat.
3. Approval of the plat by the Water Resources Commission of the Michigan Department of Conservation.
4. That the City negotiate for park purposes of all that part of the property lying South of a line 200 feet South of Tecumseh River Road.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: Fink—1.

ROW-17-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the proposed vacation of the Southerly 120 feet of the alley running between East Ionia Street and East Shiawassee Street in the 300 block of North Washington Avenue, within Urban Renewal Project No. 1 be approved as it conforms to the land use plan for Urban Renewal Project No. 1.

This alley vacation is requested by the Urban Redevelopment Board to provide the necessary land area required to proceed with the Redevelopment proposal recently submitted by Hubbard Associates for the parcel of land fronting on East Ionia Street between North Washington Avenue and North Grand Avenue. There were no objections to the vacation of this section of alley by any City Departments or Public Utilities.

Urban Renewal Project No. 1 site plans show the remaining section of the alley connected by a proposed alley which will extend to North Grand Avenue.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ROW-1-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the request by the Midway Trust Company for the City to accept a deed for a right-of-way to serve the Howard Johnson Motor Hotel and Restaurant complex on South Cedar Street near I-96 freeway to be known as Roth Drive be denied.

The Board further recommends that the street be dedicated in conjunction with a plat of the property.

The Board while being cognizant of the need to extend utilities across the site, realizes that this property has been divided contrary to the State Laws regulating the subdivision of land. Acceptance of the deed for this street would in effect constitute further division.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

The director submitted a proposed contract between the Planning Department and Redevelopment Department, complying with the Federal Government requirement which would allow the Planning Department to charge the salary of the Planner working on Urban Renewal to the Federal Government.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Fink, that the proposed contract between the Planning Department and Redevelopment Department be approved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Letter from Mr. William H. Van Duzer of the law firm of Parks, Church and Wyble regarding discussion of administrative procedures of the Planning Board with the Administrative Tribunals Committee of the Ingham County Bar Association, was read to the Board.

Received and placed on file.

Letter from the Community Services Council regarding the Greater Lansing Human Relation Award read to the Board.

Received and placed on file.

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 A.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 5, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:37 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and
Reynolds—5.

Absent: Black, Duncan and Siebert—3.

HEARINGS

P-2-68 Waverly Heights No. 10,
Preliminary Plat

D. Gregory Main, Staff, discussed the
proposal in regard to location, existing
development in the area, lot size and orien-
tation, utilities available for the pro-
posed development.

No one appeared regarding this proposed
development.

Matter was referred to the Streets Com-
mittee.

Z-2-68

Mr. Fountain, Staff, discussed the peti-
tion to rezone property in the 5900 block
of S. Washington Avenue from "A-1" fam-
ily residential to Community Unit Plan. He
stated that a total of 150 dwelling units,
plus a community building, 50 of these
units in 10 buildings for families, and 100
units in 15 bulidings for the elderly is pro-
posed. He further commented regarding
off-street parking, the size of the site, the
density proposed, ingress and egress to the
site, and land use in the vicinity of the
proposed development.

The developer, Robert Gutterman, Urban
American Land Development, was present.

Mr. Gaus asked the type of building pro-
posed. Mr. Gutterman replied the family
units will be townhouses and the elderly
will be quaterfoll, one story units. The
units are proposed to be scattered over the
site.

Mr. David Crissey, 5904 Keys Road,
representing citizens in the area of the
subject rezoning, submitted a letter to the
Board in objection of the proposed amend-

ment signed by 62 persons. A letter stating
objections was read by Mr. Crissey, received
by the Board, and placed on file.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Com-
mittee.

Z-8-68

Mr. Fountain discussed the petition to
rezone property in the 3200-3300 blocks N.
Larch Street, from "A-1" family residential
to Community Unit Plan. He stated the
proposal is for 100 dwelling units for the
elderly.

Mr. Robert Gutterman, Urban American
Land Development, the developer of the
proposed project was present, stated these
were to be efficiency and one bedroom units.
He elaborated on the building layout.

Mrs. Dennis Humphrey, 3427 Schultz
Street, representing the Sheridan Road
area residents who are opposing the rezon-
ing of this property emphasized that they
are not opposed to elderly housing, per se.
She read a letter stating their position in
this matter and submitted petitions signed
by 345 persons. Received and placed on
file. Approximately 40 persons present in
regard to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Don Burt, 3505 N. Cedar Street,
owner of property at 320 Frederick Street
which is Lot No. 48, part of the proposed
development, stated he had not been ap-
proached regarding this development and
wondred if this was correct procedure.

Mr. Joseph Hunter, 3403 N. Larch Street,
stated that all of those present in regard
to this rezoning were not necessarily op-
posed to it. Show of hands of about six
present not opposed to this rezoning.

Mrs. Charles Wilcox, 3327 Walker Street,
asked that whose expense sidewalks would be
put in if this development was approved?
Mr. Guernsey replied this would be at the
owner's expense. Mrs. Wilcox commented
regarding a number of hepatitis cases in
the area about three years ago and ques-
tioned if proper drainage has been taken
into consideration in regard to this project.

Mr. Guernsey replied that no project
could be approved unless it had adequate

drainage facilities and on a project of this size there would probably have to be storm sewer.

Mr. Howard Alexandria, 2010 Riverside Court, questioned whose responsibility it would be to pay for storm sewer? Mr. Guernsey replied it would be both the city's and the local property owner's responsibility, those property owners who would benefit by the installation of the drains.

Harold Pinkson, 2617 Maplewood, asked the means of ingress and egress to the proposed development. Mr. Fountain replied ingress and egress would be off Frederick Street.

Mr. Gaus questioned the location of parking being between the proposed building and the residential property. Mr. Gutterman stated this could be changed, that it probably should be off Larch Street.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-9-68

Mr. Fountain discussed the petition to rezone property in the 3400 block of Turner Street, from "A-1" family residential to Community Unit Plan. He stated the proposal is for 100 dwelling units in one building, and commented regarding off-street parking, the size of the subject property, the density, ingress and egress to the site and land use in the vicinity of the site.

Mr. Robert Gutterman, Urban American Land Development, developer was present and stated this would be about the same type of building as previously discussed. He spoke in regard to the need for housing for the elderly. These will be efficiency and one bedroom units.

Martha Tumminello, 3509 Creston Avenue, submitted petitions containing 344 signatures in opposition to proposed amendment. Read letter stating objections to this rezoning.

Received and placed on file.

Mrs. Humphrey, 3427 Schultz, emphasized the point that they are not opposed to elderly housing, but feel that two projects within six blocks of each other is overdoing it.

Property owner at 232 W. Fairfield, spoke in regard to drain problems in the area now. Also there are no sidewalks, curbing etc.

Mrs. Lyman, 105 W. Sheridan Road, asked if the developer could change his mind and put families in the development rather than elderly.

Barry Post, 3317 Creston, question ingress and egress to the proposed project. Mr. Fountain replied it would be off Turner

Street. Also questioned choice of location for the project.

Approximately 25 persons present in opposition to proposal.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-20-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 219-223 N. Holmes Street, from "C-2" family to "J" parking.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-21-68

Mr. Pat Callhan, Granger Associates, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5300 S. Cedar Street, from "D-M" multiple to "F" commercial district. He spoke in regard to the need for a family type restaurant which is what is proposed for the subject property. Mr. Neller from the restaurant company was also present. He stated this would be a family type restaurant, not conducive to teenagers.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the possible erection of a sign for the restaurant. He commented regarding the Board's policy concerning signs. Mr. Neller stated they were prepared to meet city codes in this matter. He presented a picture of the proposed type of building.

Mr. Gaus questioned the size of the building and was told it is proposed to be about 48 ft. to 75 ft.

Mr. Fink questioned the number of parking spaces on the site and was told by Mr. Callhan about 50 spaces.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-22-68

Mr. Gordon Wellman, Vice President, Bank of Lansing appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5226 S. Cedar Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial. He stated that minor changes in the original plans calls for a slight rearrangement of the site. They wish to move the proposed branch bank closer to Cedar Street and to construct a free standing sign.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-23-68

Mr. Louis A. Smith, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5601 S. Cedar Street, from "G-2" wholesale to "H" light industrial district. He stated his client desires to use the present structure on the site for automobile engine repair.

Phillip Carne, 5927 Joshua Street, asked for further details on the proposal.

Mr. Gaus questioned type of cars and Mr. Smith replied they would not be of the racing variety.

Mr. West 524 E. Northrup, presented petition signed by 24 person in objection to the proposed rezoning.

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Smith stated the petitioner would provide any reasonable or adequate buffer required to eliminate any distasteful use of the property. He asked the Board to consider the industrial use already in the area.

Mr. Carne questioned a trailer being parked on the site.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-24-68

Mr. Bob Strong, Halstead Realty, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1400 Northrup Street, from "A-1" to "C-2" family district. The purpose of petition is for two-family, since property backs up to Consumers Power right-of-way and two family dwelling would be more suitable here than one family.

Edward Moses, 6001 Joshua, questioned location of proposed amendment. No one spoke in opposition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-25-68

Mr. Phillip Walter appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5931 S. Cedar Street and 5920 Joshua and 625 Dellen Street, from "A-1" residential to "G-2" wholesale district. He stated that this area has a commercial character and is not conducive to residential development. Petitioner has no specific use in mind, they have been approached with various proposals for the site.

Mr. Barnes, 618 Cameo, submitted a petition in opposition to the proposed rezoning containing 35 names. He felt there was

sufficient land zoned for this type of use in the area, that they have a fine residential neighborhood and would like to keep it that way.

Edward Moses, 6001 Joshua, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Phillip Carne, 5927 Joshua, spoke in opposition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-26-68

No one spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2710-2714 S. Cedar Street, from "A-1" family to "D-1" professional office district.

Mater was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-27-68

No one spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 6830 S. Cedar Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-28-68

Mr. Harold Davis appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2600 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district. Subject property has been left out of previous zoning petition due to error. It should have been rezoned with the property to the east. There is some degree of urgency to this rezoning as the property is to be sold.

Mr. Fink asked for a clarification of the location of the proposed rezoning.

No one spoke in opposition.

Mater was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-29-68

Mr. Louis A. Smith, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 829-821 N. Chestnut, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district.

Mr. Davenport, 809 N. Chestnut, asked for a clarification of the proposed rezoning. Director replied this would permit about 14 units on this site.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-30-68

Mr. Levandowski appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1100 block Jolly Road and 5000-4900 block South Logan Street, from "A-1" and "J" parking to "F" commercial district. He stated this petition is to allow expansion of the shopping center. He submitted a plot plan enlargement.

No one spoke in objection.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-31-68

Mr. Donald Hines, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property, a portion of West Elm Street to "I" heavy industrial. He stated that the petition is twofold both a vacation of this portion of Elm Street and a rezoning which needs to be processed. He asked the Board's recognition that the subject property is completely surrounded by General Motors and is industrial use. Mr. Hines approached the Board with a diagram showing the subject property.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee and the Streets Committee.

Anthony P. Nosal, Lansing Township, spoke in regards to development on the southwest part of Lansing, the inconsistency of the city regarding procedures on Community Unit Plans, and in particular Z-26-65. He thought an opinion from the City Attorney should be obtained regarding said procedures on Community Unit Plan extensions.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Fink stated the Board should be concerned about this matter, and felt they had an obligation to obtain an answer regarding this as to whether this is part of the Board's procedure or if Council has prerogative to extend Community Unit Plans. He strongly urged that the Director obtain an opinion on the status of extensions on Community Unit Plans.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that an opinion from the City Attorney be obtained regarding a clarification on the approval of extensions for Community Unit Plans.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

RE: Z-3-68

Mr. Mitchell Skory spoke regarding his rezoning request at 901-905 Cleveland Street, from "A-1" residential to "F" commercial district.

He stated the subject property is to be acquired by the State Highway Department by 1972 for the future widening of Oakland Avenue. Submitted letter in support of previous statements.

Recess from 9:30 to 9:50 P.M.

Due to the lack of a quorum those zoning matters on the agenda are to be referred to the next regular meeting of the Board.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Heino that the minutes of January 23, 1968 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-2-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that they approve the vacation of the easterly 37.5 feet of Pennsylvania Avenue which abuts Lots 35, 36 and the northerly 130.20 feet abutting Lot 49, subject to the agreement of all property owners.

This request is initiated by Mr. W. H. Kouts, who owns Lots No. 32, 33, 34 and 35 of Midway Industrial Center No. 2. The owners of Lot No. 36 and 49 which abutts a portion of the street requested for vacation have not petition for vacation.

South Pennsylvania Avenue due to the revetments on both sides of the street in this vicinity has a width of 205 feet which is excessive to the requirements of the Major Street Plan for a Major Arterial. If the revetments on both sides of the street were vacated the width would be reduced to 135.25 feet which is well within the current standards for major streets.

All City Departments and public utilities contacted approve the request vacation and the City Assessor encourages the return of this land to the tax rolls.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-8-67F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board approve the final plat of Duncel Interchange Subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
2. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and Gutter	\$ 250.00
Monuments	150.00
Storm Sewer	960.00
Sanitary Sewer	800.00
Total	\$2,160.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the Final Plat.
4. Clearance of the plat by the Board of Water and Light.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

S-14-67F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the final plat of Hospitality Motor Inn Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
2. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Curb and Gutter	\$ 4,480.00
Monuments	250.00
Storm Sewer	12,000.00
Sanitary Sewer	12,000.00
Total	\$28,730.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

3. All required easements should be recorded on the face of the final plat.
4. Clearance of the plat by the Board of Water and Light.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES

BP-2-68

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council the approval of the leasing of Lots 215 through 223 inclusive of Franklin Heights Subdivision, to the Board of Education as they would be available for future park plans and are not imperative to immediate park needs of this area.

The Parks Board recommended to the Planning Board and City Council the leasing of the subject property on an arrangement to be negotiated between City Council and the Board of Education for the purpose of placing temporary elementary classroom unit on the property.

At the present time the subject lots are not critical to the park needs in the area as they are adjacent to Bancroft and Potter Parks but could be used in the future for a park complex in this area. City Charter limitations will not allow a lease to extend beyond a five year period.

The Board of Education would place temporary classrooms on the site to accommodate the lower elementary grades and possibly a Head Start Program which would relieve the crowded condition at High Street School.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-2-68 Waverly Heights No. 10,

Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the preliminary plat of Waverly Heights No. 10 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The subdivision shall be improved with complete public utilities and full street improvements including curb, gutter and sidewalk.
2. All lots shall be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
3. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Council action.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

BP-3-68

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council the purchase of a parcel of land known as Assessor's parcel No. 265, Outlot A, Fairfield Gardens Subdivision, for parks purposes providing negotiations can bring about a suitable purchase price.

The Parks Board recommend to the Planning Board and the City Council the acquisition of this subject property. This park site is in accord with and recommended by the Master Plan and will serve an expanding population in future years. The acquisition and development of Jones Lake for park purposes was approved as to location, character, and extent by the Planning Board at their meeting of September 6, 1966.

The Planning Board at their meeting of December 19, 1967 recommended that the City negotiate for the purchase of the parcel of land at the northeast corner of Fairfield and Cameron. This parcel is in the process of being acquired.

The Capital Improvements Program has allocated \$6,000 in 1969 for Jones Lake Park acquisition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

BP-1-68

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that after consideration of the request of the Lansing Public Schools as to the deeding to the city land for street purposes through the North School property that street improvements are needed in this area for the safety of the school children and the people using the community center, and concurs with the recommendation of the public service department subject to the approval of the City Attorney as to the proper procedure in accepting a deed for the proposed right-of-way.

The driveway as it exists is without a sidewalk, curb, and gutter and has an unsatisfactory alignment in front of the school for the parking of vehicles. It is desirable that a sidewalk be constructed, the safety improved and that the drive be maintained in good condition.

The Public Service Department makes the following recommendation:

"Enclosed is a sketch showing our recommendation for the alignment of a 60 foot right-of-way across North Elementary School property. We would recommend accepting a deed to this right-of-way at the time the School Board filed a petition or a letter of intent for the construction of a

storm sewer, a 36 foot face to face curb and gutter street with six inches of 22A gravel."

The City Traffic Engineer concurs with the recommendation of the Public Service Department.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

Subdivision Regulations—Copies of the proposed subdivision regulations have previously been forwarded to the Board. City Council is to hold a hearing on the proposed regulations on March 11. This is to be a joint meeting with the Planning Board. At the Redevelopment Board meeting on March 14 the Planning Board should make their recommendation on the Subdivision Regulations to be forwarded to City Council the following Monday night.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board hold a special meeting on March 14, 1968 for the purpose of consideration of the Subdivision Regulation.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Urban Renewal No. 2 preliminary background report will be presented to the Redevelopment and Planning Boards on March 14, 1968.

FINANCE

Mr. Guernsey stated there would be a meeting of the Finance Committee to alter, if needed, budget recommendations for 1968-69. A date is to be set soon.

Amendment to Section 3.5 of the "Policy and Procedures of the Planning Board" as follows:

Paragraph a. which reads, "Five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the taking of official action except, no official action shall be taken as to the adoption of a Master Plan, or any part of a Master Plan or to recommend the rezoning of property to the City Council without six (6) affirmative votes."

Delete the words or to recommend the rezoning of property to the City Council, the revised paragraph to read as follows:

"Five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the taking of official action except, no official action shall be taken as to the adoption of

a Master Plan, or any part of a Master Plan, without six (6) affirmative votes."

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the proposed amendment be referred to the Committee of The Whole for their consideration.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported on progress on the Model Cities Application. A workshop on the Model Cities Program is to be held in Washington, which is being sponsored by NAHRO National Association of Housing and Redvelopment Officials.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds that Mr. Brown, Assistant Director be authorized to attend the Model Cities Workshop in Washington, D.C.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Public Hearings on Model Cities will be held on March 6 and 13 at Oak Park and Michigan Avenue Schools respectively.

SS-24-67

Shopping Center Study Report No. 3. This report has been previously distributed to the Board. A discussion on this matter will be set at a later date.

Meeting adjourned at 10:25 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, March 19, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds
and Siebert—5.

Absent: Black, Duncan and Heino—3.

HEARINGS

Z-6-68

Patrick Eyde, 1707 Boynton, spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at Southwest corner of Main and Washington, from "C-2" and "D-M" to "G" Business District. He stated the proposed use of the property is for a fifteen story motor hotel, the top story to be a rooftop restaurant, first floor would be lobby and small restaurant, second floor would be 10,000 square feet of convention rooms, and the rest of the structure would be rooms. A two layer ramp is proposed, right of way off Washington Avenue at present.

Mr. Fink asked how many rooms are projected and was advised 250 rooms are proposed. He questioned if this is adequate and Mr. Eyde replied that a Chicago firm recommended this amount for convention facilities after a market demand study.

Mr. Fink questioned the parking facilities on the site. Mr. Eyde replied it would be approximately three hundred on the bottom ramp and about 125 on the top ramp.

Discussion followed on setback requirements, parking layout, and proposed height of 160 ft. to 170 ft. for which a variance from the Board of Zoning Appeals would be required.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:55 P.M.

Mr. Black arrived during the recess period.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-192-66

Reconsideration of the proposed Community Unit Plan located at 3206 Aurelius Road.

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus, that a Community Unit Plan is invited on the subject property which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.
2. That the applicant work out details of housing types and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
3. That the property be filled so as not to be affected by flooding. Final grade plans to be filed prior to issuance of building permits.
4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans, the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

SS-7-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Fink, that a special permit be granted for the use of the property at 705 W. Michigan Avenue as a neighborhood center.

This request is by the Capitol Area Economic Committee. The property is presently owned by the State and leased to the City. The Lansing Zoning Code specifies that City Council, after a public hearing, may authorize by Special Permit, the location of a community building in any district from which it is prohibited.

The renovation necessary to make this building available for the use of a neighborhood center has been completed. This will release their present facility on St.

Joseph Street to the City Parks and Recreation Department for use as a drop in center. The building is a large two story with an attic frame residence which is presently vacant. It is estimated that this property will be available to the city for a period of 18 to 30 months before the State will want repossession of the property. During the period that this property will be used as a neighborhood center the immediate area will be going through a period of transition from residential to a vacant area for the future capitol area expansion.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-188-66

Reconsideration of the Board recommendation of January 16, 1968 on the proposed community unit plan located in the 1800 and 1900 Hoyt Avenue.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that a Community Unit Plan be invited on the subject property which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.
2. That the gross density not exceed 12 dwelling units per acre.
3. That the applicant work out details of housing types, and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following votes:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-55-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by D. B. Hodges, to rezone a parcel at 833 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to Professional Offices district be granted.

The site is located within the area designated for offices and services, as shown on the Central City Plan.

The parcel is small in area with a high percent of building coverage. If develop-

ment were to proceed as requested, additional land may have to be acquired for off-street parking.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-58-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Melvin Monroe, to rezone a parcel at 2227 W. Miller Road, from "A-1" residential to "F" commercial district be denied.

The change of zoning would encourage further strip or four-corner commercial development in this area, and would detract from planned commercial centers.

The change of zoning may foster uncontrolled development in the area, and promote inharmonious land use relationships.

The South Logan Street Zoning Policy, which was recommended by the Planning Board to City Council at their meeting of January 16, 1968, recommended that the subject property be retained in a low density residential category.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-158-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Francis F. Fine, to rezone a parcel at 3325 E. Michigan Avenue, described as:

The E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of E. $\frac{1}{2}$ of W. $\frac{1}{2}$ of S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ and North $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of East $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 13, T4N, R2W, also a strip of land $1\frac{1}{2}$ rods in width off the East side of South $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of East $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 13, T4N, R2W, Lansing Township, now City of Lansing, excepting the South 396 feet of the East $11\frac{1}{2}$ rods of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the S.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of the N.W. $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 13, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan subject to the right-of-way on the West side thereof for street purposes, as well as any and all other easements, restrictions and rights of records, except the North 170 ft. thereof.

"D-M" Multiple to "D-1" Professional district, be denied as filed and that the East 10 ft. of the property be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "J" parking and the balance of the property be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional subject to the following conditions:

1. That the property be platted and that the preliminary plat be filed and approved prior to the approval of the zoning.
2. The plat should reflect a satisfactory lot arrangement and street access and alignment from Michigan Avenue North to the Oak Ridge.
3. That the parking areas be depressed approximately 2 ft. where they abut the residential district to the East. Covered carports could be installed to take the place of the required screening.

Screening and landscaping to be provided along the East line of the property.

The Board further recommends that the parcel at the Southwest corner of the subject property more particularly described as:

The balance of the South $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of the East $\frac{1}{2}$ of West $\frac{1}{2}$ of Southwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of Section 13, T4N, R2W, except the South 396 ft. thereof,

be rezoned from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional district.

This change would be more consistent with the overall zoning and development pattern of the area.

The parcel of land in question is unique in the sense that development has taken place which completely surrounds the site. Approximately 40% of the existing adjacent development is of a commercial nature, and the balance in residential ranging from medium density apartment development to single family.

The proposed use of the property would not be unreasonable in relation to the existing land use in the area. It would provide for a desirable transition between the commercial development and residential areas.

The proposed street access to the site will be from Michigan Avenue running North to the apartment complex in East Lansing. The completion of this route will provide development in this area with ease of access to two major streets (Michigan and Grand River Avenue). The Board further believes that this will help prevent the utilization of Hyland Street as a major thoroughfare which is one of the concerns of the East Lansing Planning Department.

Another condition that must be given consideration to effectuate the overall plan

is the screening requirements along the East property line, which is adjacent to single family residential. The Board believes this could be accomplished by providing a minimum 10 ft. planting strip along the East property line, or if off-street parking is proposed adjacent to the East property line it should be depressed approximately 2 ft. (depending on depth of storm sewer facilities) with covered carports.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-163-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition to rezone property at 3418 Forest Road, from "A-1" family to "D-M" multiple district be tabled for thirty days upon request of the applicant.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-1-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Bennie C. Wickens, to rezone a parcel at 3111 Aurelius Road, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family district, be denied as filed and that the West 157 ft. of the property be rezoned from "A-1" family to "C-2" family. This will promote single family development on the rear portion of the lot in conjunction with the property to the North.

The site under consideration is located within the area known as the Forest View Community. The Board has prepared a text for the Master Plan Revision of the Forest View Area which reflects existing and potential land use development, and policy for guiding future growth.

The property in question is proposed for low density residential development 5-6 dwelling units per gross acre.

The size of the site (29,403 square feet) and development proposed would be in keeping with the density recommended. This would also be true if the rear portion of this lot were split off and utilized for further development on Robinson Road.

Further justification for this request is that; the proposed development would act as a transitional use between Aurelius Road and the existing and potential development to the East, and would not be incompatible with the existing development.

Aurelius Road is proposed as a major arterial. Existing R.O.W. at this point is 66 ft., with a minimum of 100 ft. R.O.W. projected. Therefore, the Board would rec-

commend that the property owner take this into consideration and locate any new development on the property the additional footage back from Aurelius Road to compensate for the proposed widening.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-3-68

Motion by Siebert, that the petition to rezone property at 901-905 Cleveland Street, from "B-1" family residential to "F" commercial district be granted.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—5.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Duncan and Siebert—2.

Z-4-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by S. & S. T.V. and Appliances, to rezone a parcel at 5300 S. Cedar Street, from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial district be denied.

A request similar in nature was considered by the Board, February 6, 1968 for the property immediately to the South. The Board recommended denial of the request based on the following:

The site under consideration is located at the southern end of the Jolly-Cedar Shopping Complex. The entire complex is zoned "F" commercial and "J" parking. The "J" parking district extends approximately 178 ft. West of South Cedar Street and provides for adequate off-street parking and setback.

The southern portion of this shopping complex has been divided off and is being developed. It is quite possible with each new development request for a sign adjacent to the street right-of-way will be requested.

Adequate set-backs for off-street and aesthetic qualities have been assured, and the location of any signs within this setback should be given careful consideration.

The indiscriminate placing of advertising signs will negate the aesthetic values built into the area and generally contribute to the chaotic confusing situation prevalent on most commercially developed streets.

The Board believes that if the sign proposed is located on or as close as possible to the building development, a precedent will be established, which will promote a

more aesthetically pleasing commercial district.

It should be further pointed out that other requests of this nature have been considered North of this site by both the Planning Board and Board of Zoning Appeals, and in each case were discouraged.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-5-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Rodney Colby, to rezone a parcel at 1215 E. Jolly Road, from "A-1" family to "C-2" family be denied.

The Board believes that the proposed change would be incompatible with development in the area, and it is not impossible to make reasonable use of the land in accord with the existing zoning.

There were several members in the audience who were interested in structure and which way it would face.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert.

Nays: None.

Z-6-68

Motion by Siebert, that the petition be tabled pending further information regarding the proposed development.

No second.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that the rules of procedure be suspended to allow the petitioner to speak at this point.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Eyde, petitioner, stated the time element is important because of franchises which can not be finalized until the zoning is finalized.

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the petition by Patrick Eyde and Michael Eyde, to rezone a parcel at the S.W. corner of Main and Washington, described as:

Lot 13, except the East 4 feet thereof, and the entire Lots 14 and 15 of Block 177 of the Original Plat of said City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "C-2" family and "D-M" multiple to "G" business district be granted.

In terms of the Master Plan this area may be described as a transitional area. In other words it is in an area that could functionally be an integral part of the central core if this emphasis is deemed desirable.

Certainly its proximity and direct accessibility to the central business district, its availability to a fine expressway system would justify a high intensity use of the property. A hotel complex would not be inconsistent with the most desirable kind of development and should contribute handsomely to the development of the Central City.

The development as proposed will not adversely affect development of the Central area in view of the fact that it may be considered an integral part of the central city and indeed materially promote the vitality of the core and continued private investment therein.

In view of the above there does not appear to be any justifiable reason why this property should not be used by a high intensity use.

Adjacent property values would not be adversely affected and the public health, safety and welfare will be maintained by this rezoning.

Aesthetically the effect of a multi story structure at this point with its relationship to the Capitol Development area should enhance the overall architectural scale of the Central Business area by providing a kind of signpost advising inter-urban and therefore non-familial traffic to the fact that it has now entered the central core of Lansing. All too often expressway type highways particularly when depressed have the effect of making the driver Ignorant of where he is and where services may be available for his pleasure. Such could be the purpose of a large personal service structure on the expressway at a pertinent point identifying the entry to the central business district. Therefore aiding in capturing a clientele for the Central Business District.

The Board recommends that the property be rezoned on the basis of the above analysis. The Board is however cognizant of the fact that the existing zoning ordinance in no way guarantees a type of development which would reflect the kind of analysis that was made, rather this analysis is based upon a specific proposal.

The Board therefore, recommends that the property be rezoned in such a manner as to require the land to be used in the manner proposed by the zoning submission. The ordinance as drafted should require a certain performance, from the property and structure to be situated thereon.

Accordingly, the Board recommends that the property in question be zoned "G" busi-

ness and subject to the following conditions, which conditions should constitute an integral part of the ordinance amendment:

1. Use Permitted Subject to Special Conditions:

A. That the land be used for the purpose of a motor hotel and/or apartment hotel, and apartment and accessory uses which may include the following:

- (1) Recreational facilities such as suana baths, swimming pool, tennis courts, shuffle board courts, lawn bowling and similar recreation facilities when exclusively devoted to the tenants and/or occupants of the main use as opposed to general admission by the public.
- (2) Ancilliary uses which may include professional offices limited to the first two storeys above the established grade, dining rooms, cocktail lounge, banquet facilities, personal service shops, all of which shall be accessible from within the main building and shall not have direct access from the outside.
- (3) Other accessory uses which may include parking garages and/or ramps.
- (4) Landscaping and other environmental improvements such as fountains, sculpture, statues, etc.
- (5) Signs, except that when same are free standing they shall be subject to the approval of the Planning Board.

B. The main structure shall not cover an area in excess of forty (40) percent of the established grade, which grade for the purpose of this ordinance may include the finished floor elevation of a parking structure, which may cover the parcel pursuant to the yard requirements of the "G" business district and which in any event shall not exceed an elevation of 863 ft.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-10-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Gordon Collison, to rezone a parcel at 2506 N. Grand River, from "A-1" family, "J" parking, and "H" light industry to "H" light industry district, be denied.

The property under consideration, and adjacent properties have been considered by the Planning Board and City Council in the past. In each case the recommendations regarding zoning and land use have reflected an attempt to protect the existing residential development along the South side of Grand River Avenue. The traffic congestion that would follow strip zoning of the street, and the aesthetic qualities that can be assured if proper zoning controls are applied. A good example of this treatment is the Grand River access road. Southeast of this site.

In October 1964, the Planning Board considered a request to rezone property East of this site to permit the expansion of the Auto Salvage Company. This request was approved (Z-85-64).

A subsequent recommendation regarding the extension of the Grand River access road was made by the Planning Board in November 1964. (R.O.W. 7-64). The contents of this recommendation, and maps which portray a proposed street alignment, and land use pattern were included with the recommendation. (See Z-85-64, ROW-7-64) The City Council adopted the Board's recommendation.

The property under consideration is directly involved in the overall plan, and if zoned as requested could deter its development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-11-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles E. Jacobs, to rezone a parcel at 1006 Jerome Street, from "D-M" multiple to "F" commercial be granted.

The Board believes that; due to the existing land use in the vicinity, and the nature of land use on the subject property, (book store) which provides a service to the Junior and Senior High School complex to the North, a change in zoning will not contribute any adverse affects on the surrounding area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-12-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to

City Council that the petition by P. & K. Corporation, to rezone a parcel at 1933 N. Larch Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial be denied.

The Zoning Board recommends to the Planning Board that the petition be denied.

The site under consideration is presently zoned "F" commercial and "J" parking. The requested change is to permit the expansion of the existing development (Laundromat).

The concern in this case is not so much the Land Use Development Pattern, (the subject property and much of the property in the vicinity is zoned and developed in a commercial nature) but how the individual sites are developed.

The use on the site generates automobile traffic and creates a demand for off-street parking. Lansing's Zoning Ordinance is silent in regards to off-street parking requirements for commercial uses.

The applicant has submitted a plot plan which depicts the existing and proposed building expansion and off-street parking.

The existing laundromat's operation contains a gross floor area of 2,400 square feet, and 44 washing machines. The proposed addition will increase the gross floor area to 4,000 square feet, and make available additional area for 20 washing machines for a total of 62.

Lansing's proposed Zoning Ordinance requires off-street parking on the basis of 1-space for each 2 washing machines.

The Board has found that Ordinances in other Municipalities require parking for laundromat operations on the basis 1-space for each 200 square feet of gross floor area, or 1-space for each 2-washing machines. In either way the site under consideration with the proposed addition could not meet these minimum requirements.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-13-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by L. E. Reynolds, to rezone a parcel at 722 N. Logan from "B-1" family to "D-M" multiple district be denied as filed and that the property be rezoned from "B-1" family residence to "C-2" family residence.

The subject property is located within an area designated as being a desirable place for multiple dwellings of a two story townhouse type, in the Central City Plan. However, the size of the subject property

negates the possibility of any redevelopment which would be within the guidelines of the Central City Plan. For this reason this petition should be considered only as it relates to the existing land use patterns in the area.

With this thought in mind the following analysis is made:

The petitioner has requested "D-M" multiple dwelling zoning with the expressed intent of converting the existing structure for occupancy as a 3 unit building. If the petition were granted and the building were converted, six parking spaces would be required. It is highly doubtful that they could be provided. The physical dimensions of the rear yard are large enough to provide six spaces, but a large tree centered in the rear yard prevents this possibility. If the tree were removed and the entire rear yard were hard surfaced, storm water runoff would cause problems.

On the other hand, "C-2" zoning would permit the existing use and would allow physical improvements to the property. The properties immediately East are zoned "C-2" and extension of the two family district to Logan Street is logical.

Motion carried the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Reynolds—1.

Z-14-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Weaver-Kessler Realty, to rezone a parcel at 5100 S. Logan Street, from "C-2" family to "F" commercial district be denied.

The parcel under consideration has been considered by the Planning Board for both rezoning, and a subdivision plat. The request for rezoning to "D-M" multiple was denied and "C-2" family zoning was recommended subject to the property being platted. The City Council concurred in the Board's recommendation, and the developer proceeded and completed plans on this basis.

Lot 12 of the plat was exceptional to other lots within the plat. The lot had frontage on Belaire Avenue a residential street and on Logan Street, which in the immediate vicinity is made up of mixed commercial uses.

It was therefore suggested that extra depth be applied to the lot in question and that a plat restriction be recorded prohibiting vehicular access from Logan Street.

This recommendation was implemented and is now part of the recorded plat. The

predominate reasons for these conditions were:

1. The limited access on Logan Street would eliminate a conflict of traffic with development of the property, and discourage commercial development from penetrating the existing and potential residential area.
2. The additional depth of the lot allows for screening from Logan Street and the commercial development to the South, and will help retain the residential characteristics.

Current review of the request now under consideration indicates that the change would be contrary to the established Land Use Pattern by allowing the intrusion of a commercial use into the existing and proposed residential district.

The basic land use conditions have not changed in this area, nor has development of the area been contrary to existing regulations.

The change could adversely influence living conditions on the adjacent residential properties principally through the increased noise, activity, and loss of privacy. This could also deter the improvement or development of the adjacent properties in accord with the existing zoning regulations, and may therefore adversely affect property values.

There are also substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning. In fact the physical features and Plat restrictions encourage residential development.

There are other properties in the vicinity that are zoned and would accommodate the proposed use.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-15-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Jonathan Watts, to rezone a parcel at 1801 W. Main from "E-2" Drive-In to "F" commercial be denied as filed and recommends "E-2" Drive-In to "D-1" professional district.

The Board believes that this change will promote redevelopment of the property, with the least adverse affect on the surrounding area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-16-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Joyce and Kenneth Finch, to rezone a parcel at 2712 Aurelius Road, from "A-1" residential to "D-M" multiple district be denied, and further recommend that the property be considered for "D-M.1" multiple zoning if and when the Ordinance is adopted. This would allow a density compatible with the proposed development plan for this area.

The site under consideration is located within the area proposed for medium density residential development as indicated on the Forest View Community Plan.

The change would be contrary to the existing and proposed land use development, and would alter the population density, thereby increasing the load on public facilities (schools, sewers, streets). This is especially true if the development were family oriented, and the maximum density allowed were developed.

The basic land use conditions in the area have not changed, but there are several development proposals all of which fall within the maximum recommended density of 12 dwelling units per acre.

The change could adversely influence living conditions in the neighborhood principally through the increase in traffic and activity. This is especially true if the existing single family development remains, and there is indiscriminate zoning and development of multi-family uses.

The changes of zoning as requested would give the property owner an advantage over others in the area as the maximum density allowed in the "D-M" multiple district is 29 units per acre, as opposed to the 12 units per acre recommended on other requests in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-17-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 600 W. Shiawassee Street from D apartment district to D-1 professional office district be denied.

Motion failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Reynolds, Siebert—5.

Nays: Gaus—1.

Abstain: Duncan—1.

Z-18-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by H. J. Scherer, to rezone a parcel at 2200 S. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "J" parking district be denied.

The application represents the fourth petition for rezoning of this property since September, 1965. The Planning Board and City Council has consistently denied these applications.

New and used car sales are consistently, large space users, and should be located in heavy commercial or possibly warehousing districts. The incompatibility of this use with respect to the adjacent residential district was attested by the residents of the area at the Board's Public Hearing. Several comments were made about the increased use of Riley Street for test drives and the general untidiness of the subject property.

Even with additional lot zoned for parking, the site would still be considerably less than desirable and would merely postpone the problem of inadequate size for a short time.

The proximity of this site to the Maplewood Elementary and Walter French Junior High School should also be considered. The intersection of Riley and Cedar Street is subject to high volumes of pedestrian traffic in the form of school children walking to and from these schools. The conflict between these children and the vehicular traffic generated by this use should be kept to a minimum.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-19-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. Charles D. Benson, to rezone a parcel at 5134 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district be denied as filed, and that the East 163 ft. of the property be zoned "F" commercial and "J" parking, and the balance of the property being the West 199.9 ft. remain in its present zoning classification, subject to a site plan being submitted by the applicant, indicating the proposed building addition and off-street parking.

The site is located within an area where development occurred prior to annexation, sound zoning controls were not applied and indiscriminate mixing of land use took place. Development of the property is of good quality, but because of existing zoning regulation ("A-1" family) improvements or expansion are limited.

The proposed change for a portion of the property (approximately the East 163 ft.) would not be contrary to the established land use pattern, and would be in conformance with the Boards Zoning Policy for this area of South Logan Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-27-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at 6830 S. Cedar Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district be granted and further recommends that the Westerly 5 ft. of Lot 73, except that part described as beginning at the N.E. corner of said lot, thence West along the North line 207.5 ft. to the N.W. corner, thence Northeasterly to the point of beginning be rezoned from "J" parking to "F" commercial all property being a part of "Just A Mere Farm," Subdivision, City of Lansing.

The site under consideration is isolated, and cannot be developed when considering its relationship to ownership lines, and land use.

The property to the East which this parcel is a part of is developed with a Motel Complex. The property was rezoned by action of the City Council April 19, 1965. Previous records do not indicate why the subject parcel was not given consideration at that time. One would assume from this that an oversight occurred, and due to present ownership of the property and existing land use conditions, further consideration should be given on zoning of the property.

The Board does not believe the variation will seriously affect any adjoining property or the general welfare, and will be in keeping with the general intent of the land use development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-28-68

Motion by Siebert seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone a parcel of property at 2600 N. Grand River Avenue, described as:

That part of Lot 12 described as commencing at the S.E. corner of Lot 12, thence Northwesterly along the Southerly line Lot 12, and 14, thence North easterly to Northwest corner Lot 11, thence South to beginning, supervisor's

Plat of Deihm Farms, City of Lansing, Ingham County

from "A-1" family to "E-2" Drive-in district be granted.

The site under consideration is isolated between two commercial districts and uses.

The property is adjacent to the Westline of Lot 11 Supervisor's Plat of Deihm Farms, and is under the same ownership. It can be clearly pointed out in this case that the zoning district lines are illogically drawn in relation to existing conditions. The change will not adversely affect any adjoining property or the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-3-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request to vacate the southerly 211.98 feet of the 50 foot Latham Street right of way be denied and that Latham Street be retained by the City for future street purposes.

The 24 hour traffic count on South Cedar in the vicinity of Miller Road is 16,816 vehicles. South Cedar Street will no doubt have to be widened in the future. The amount of commercial uses on South Cedar with an excessive number of curb cuts impedes the flow of traffic on South Cedar therefore Latham Street in this area serves as a service road and is desirable from this point of view. Additional driving lanes will be needed and the safety of South Cedar should be improved. It would not be advisable for the City to release land which could be required at a later date as a part of South Cedar or as an access road to abutting properties.

The City Public Service Board and the Michigan State Highway Department both recommend that this request for vacation be denied, because of future use as a street.

The Fire Marshall will not approve the request unless there are plans to show the south end of Latham Street returning to Cedar Street and the extension of Dellen Street to South Cedar.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-4-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the Planning Board recommend to City

Council that the request to vacate that part of West Elm Street lying west of the west right of way line of Townsend Street, City of Lansing, be approved subject to the retention by the City of Lansing, of a full width utility easement.

Oldsmobile has initiated a request to rezone the section of the street requested for vacation to I heavy industrial. In that that street deadends at the Oldsmobile Motor Works, it is only used by traffic destined for this plant.

All public utilities and City Departments approve this vacation. The Public Service Department and the Board of Water and Light requests utility easements for their equipment located in this street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

ROW-5-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that after consideration of the deeding of property on West Jolly Road for street purposes that Ordinance No. 1250, City of Lansing, be amended by the deletion of the words "be subject to platting" and that the addition of "subject to the deeding to the City of Lansing of 17 feet frontage of Jolly Road for street purposes."

This property was zoned C-2 by City Council subject to platting. The owners of the property have requested the City that the platting requirements be waived and that the City accept a deed for the land needed for future widening of Jolly Road in this vicinity. The petitioner offers to deed 19 feet actually 17 feet from the properties on each side of Jolly Road is adequate.

The Planning Board can see no objection to the deeding of the necessary 17 feet for street purposes instead of platting.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES

BP-4-67

Motion by Duncan supported by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that a special use permit for construction of the proposed additions to allow expansion of the Ingham Medical Hospital located on Greenlawn Street be issued, subject to the following conditions:

The development be carried out in substantial accordance with the site plan dated March 12, 1968.

The parking areas and drives be setback at least 10 feet from all property lines.

Dense evergreen plantings consistent in mature heights and size with the existing plantings be provided along the most southerly line to the Stabler Street extension.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds brought the Board up to date on urban renewal activity. He stated the Urban Renewal Committee would like to meet with the Zoning Committee for further discussion on Urban Renewal No. 2.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Fink that the Urban Renewal Committee meet with the Zoning Committee on March 27, 1968 at 7:00 A.M. for formulation of a recommendation of the Urban Renewal committee to the Planning Board regarding Urban Renewal No. 2.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Guernsey stated that the 1968-73 Capital Improvements Program has been printed and is ready for general distribution. The Board has received their copy.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters from Louis A. Smith, attorney regarding Z-29-68 and Z-23-68 were received and placed on file.

NEW BUSINESS

Amendment to Planning Board Rules of Procedure.

Motion by Fink seconded by Duncan that Section 3.5 of the Policy and Procedures of the Planning Board be amended as follows:

Paragraph a. which reads, "Five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the taking of official action except, no official action shall be taken as to the adoption of a Master Plan, or any part of a Master Plan or to recommend the rezoning of property to the City Council without six (6) affirmative votes.

Delete the words: or to recommend the rezoning of property to the City Council the revised paragraph to read as follows:

"Five members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, and the taking of official action, except no official action shall be taken as to the adoption of a Master Plan or any part of a Master Plan without six (6) affirmative votes."

Mr. Black asked if the proposed change would affect City Council procedure on rezoning and Mr. Guernsey replied they would not be affected by this recommendation since Council may pass a resolution by a simple majority of the Council.

Mr. Fink stated this ruling would enable the Planning Board to adopt similar procedure and policy as the City Council.

Mr. Black raised the question if a zoning is an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance is considered as being an amendment to the Master Plan. He stated that to his knowledge enabling legislation in Michigan does not contain that specific wording. This point is unclear, and an opinion from the City Attorney has been requested on this particular point. It appears however that it does not apply as a Master Plan change.

Mr. Black stated he was opposed to this amendment because there is a validity in more than a simple majority in a change of the zoning ordinance. Most places it is necessary to have more than a majority to change the zoning ordinance. The whole purpose of the procedure is to make it difficult to change once established. I

think this is a valid reason. It is not a question of a one man one vote procedure.

Mr. Reynolds commented that until five years ago when the six vote ruling came into effect the board was operating on the five vote procedure. Passing were zonings that were controversial. Since that time there have been so many matters with no quorum. We should stress better attendance.

Mr. Fink called the Board's attention to the fact that City Council, which is legally authorized for changing of zoning that for planning board recommendation six votes are needed, and City Council change zoning with five votes. Think this is valid enough reason for planning board to operate on this five vote procedure also.

Further discussion followed.

Vote to amend Section 3.5 of the Policy and Procedures of the Planning Board failed by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Reynolds—4.

Nays: Black, Gaus, Siebert—3.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the validity of the vote on Z-3-68 and Z-17-68 be checked and if necessary be reconsidered at the next meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 2, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:55 P.M. by
Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus and Reynolds—4.

Absent: Duncan, Fink, Heino and Siebert—4.

HEARINGS

Z-32-68

Michael Warren 900 American Bank & Trust, attorney representing petitioner, spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4500 S. Cedar Street from "A-1" family to "J" parking district. Mr. Warren stated the petitioner owned the property immediately to the south of the subject property which is commercial. He

plans to add on to the commercial property and use the subject property for parking for that store on the commercial property.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-33-68

Ralph Gunther, secretary of Dard, Inc. spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1306-1314 Center Street and 417 Liberty Street, from "J" parking and "C-2" family district to "H" light industrial district. Mr. Gunther stated that due to the increase volume of business it is necessary to expand their operation with a larger building. The subject property lies across the street within one block of present offices, upon which a building is proposed. This location is well suited for light industrial.

Mr. Reynolds questioned that amount of parking needed and the volume of customers.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-34-68

Mr. Walter Pettifor, spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 515 Samantha Street from "A-1" family to "B-1" family district. He stated their intent was to renovate and upgrade the present building and lease it to the Cedarway Free Methodist Church for classroom space.

Mr. Smith, 4419 S. Cedar Street, spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning, in behalf of his mother and himself. They thought there would be too much noise if the building was used as a classroom facility.

Mr. Pettifor stated the building would not be used for a nursery school during the week, that this would not be a playground type activity.

Ralph Chapman, Treasurer of the Cedarway Free Methodist Church, spoke in regard to the need for this facility.

Mr. Davis, in behalf of the property owner immediately north of the subject property, spoke in regard to the previous use of this building.

Mr. Pettifor emphasized that the lot is not intended for a play area, rather that the building is to be used as church classroom space. The cement block building on the property has been vacant since July of 1967.

The Secretary of the Cedarway Free Methodist Church, emphasized the need of the church for this type of facility.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-35-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 725, 727, 729 and 731 N. Larch and 730 and 732 N. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to "H" light industrial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-36-68

Mr. Hannibal Abood, representing the owner of the subject property, spoke in regard to the petition to rezone property at 700-706 N. Washington Avenue, from "D-1" professional to "J" parking district. He distributed a site plan for the proposal stating it is a little different than stated on the petition. The request is for the east 70 ft. of the property at 700 N. Washington Avenue. Purpose: to demolish the present structure and build a two story office building. Does not feel this will hinder traffic in any way. The request does not now include 706 N. Washington Avenue.

Mr. Black questioned the parking requirements for "D-1", asking why a change in zoning was necessary at all? Mr. Guernsey stated the request is to permit the extension of the parking area toward East Saginaw Street.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-37-68

Mr. Michael Stafford, attorney representing Pure Oil Company, petitioners, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property in the 4600 block of Dunkel Road, from "A-1" family to "E-2" drive-in district. Mr. Stafford stated the request is for "E-2" zoning to permit the construction of a gas station. He commented in regard to a new development immediately across Dunkel Road and the need for a service station in this area, the suitability of the subject property for the proposed use.

He submitted a plat map of the area, an artist's conception of the proposed service station, and pictures of the type of station proposed which are already now in use in other areas. Suggested the proposed use would be an auxiliary use to the development in the area and would serve as a convenience and necessity.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out two service stations would soon be under construction nearby at the expressway.

Mr. Bell, 4901 Southgate, spoke in regard to the danger of the intersection of Duncel Road and Cavanaugh Road.

Mr. Charles Green, developer of the project referred to by Mr. Stafford, stated he thought the petitioner was presumptuous in his application for this rezoning. The 1,380 units proposed across the street are to be started very soon. He doubted that the location of the service station would be such that it could service the apartment units without driving onto Duncel Road from another location. Service stations should be in a planned area where they can be controlled since the "E-2" classification allows other uses which could be a detriment in this area. He requested the Board to maintain a harmonious development in this area until such a time as it is determined what the needs of the area will require regarding service stations. He stated he was also speaking for Mr. Kassuba of the Kassuba Development Company.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-38-68

Mr. Michael Stafford, attorney, appearing in behalf of the petitioner, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at East Jolly Road at Duncel (4800 block of Duncel Road) from "A-1" family to "D-1" professional and "E-2" drive-in district.

Mr. Stafford pointed out the location of the intersection, which is zoned "A-1" residential. The area immediately across Jolly Road is designated for future industrial development. The area to the east is to be a community unit plan which adjoins 15 acres which is to be commercial. He stated that an area next to an industrial is no longer fit for residential development. The need for the proposed rezoning will occur before long.

Mr. Charles Green objected in behalf of himself and Mr. Kassuba, developer.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-39-68

Mr. William Van Duzer, attorney representing the petitioner, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3214 N. East Street from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district. The four property owners petitioning were present. The contemplated use for Lot No. 5 of the property is for a Kentucky Fried Chicken drive-in. Submitted a plot plan. Stated the drive would be off Community Street for patrons. There is 20 ft. easement to the north of Lot No. 5 which is accessible to the pro-

posed development. Proper screening is contemplated for the drive-in.

Mr. Black suggested that the parking situation be analyzed for the Zoning Committee consideration of this request.

Mr. Eberley the owner of Lots 5, 6, and 7 stated the building would be 65 ft. deep. Parking would be on both sides of the building and in back of the easement area. The garage on the site will be torn down.

Mr. Van Duzer stated that they will submit detailed, firm plans of the parking and the traffic pattern.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-40-68

Mr. Michael Stafford, attorney representing the petitioner, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 605 to 639 East Jolly Road, from "A-1" family to "D-1" professional and "D-M" multiple dwelling district. He stated it is the petitioner's intent to subdivide the property and develop it with apartments and professional offices. He described the surrounding land use, and the traffic pattern in the area.

Mr. Gaus asked if the petitioner had any specific plans as to the amount of professional and apartments being contemplated? Mr. Stafford replied that the petitioner had submitted a site plan showing which parcels desired as "D-1" and which desired as "D-M".

George Grueder, 4909 Southgate, objected to the proposed rezoning on the basis that it is adjacent to a residential area and that there seems to be sufficient apartment complexes in the south end.

Mrs. Ronald Cline, 4928 Southgate, spoke in objection to the proposal, as did Mrs. Donald Boyer, 632 Spokane; Bob Howell, 4900 Southgate; Carl Mulberry, Spokane; William Bell, 4901 Southgate; Paul Robin, 5009 Southgate; Louis Smith, 5008 Southgate.

Additional information on what specifically is proposed for the site was requested by those persons listed above.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-41-68

Mr. Max Curtis, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3303 E. Michigan Avenue, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial. He stated that the subject property was used as commercial but

had reverted to "A-1" upon its annexation to the City.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-42-68

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2421 N. Grand River Avenue, from "A-1" to "D" apartment district.

Mrs. Robinson, 2223 Coolidge Street, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-43-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 527 N. Capitol Avenue, from "D-M" multiple to "D-1" professional office district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-44-68

George Laird, representing Culligan Water Conditions, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5321 North Pennsylvania, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district. He stated a drive through auto wash is proposed for the subject property. A screening wall along the back of the lot is intended. The architect's drawing can be furnished if necessary. Pictures of the type of building proposed and also of this type of car wash currently in operation were shown to the Board.

Thomas Sutskin, 1018 Willemma, objected to the proposed use until proper screening is provided, which was promised by the former owners of this property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

All zoning matters on the agenda were referred to the April 16, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board due to the lack of a voting quorum being present.

Meeting adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, April 16, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by
Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino
and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Duncan and Siebert—2.

URBAN RENWEAL NO. 2

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black,
that the rules be suspended to allow dis-
cussion of Urban Renewal Project No. 2.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Black,
that the Planning Board make the follow-
ing recommendation to the City Council
regarding Urban Renewal Project No. 2.

1. The present boundaries of Project No. 2 be revised to Cedar Street on the east, and that the west, north and south boundaries remain as per the original application.
2. The treatment for the revised project boundaries should be total clearance for which the City should seek an amendatory for additional funds.
3. The area excluded from Project No. 2 be incorporated into a future Urban Renewal Project and based on an over-all plan for the Cedar Larch corridor and that a study be made of the possible relocation of the City Market in the corridor.
4. The land within the revised boundaries and excluding the Community College expansion area be designated for office-commercial structures and public uses.
5. All of parcels 8 and 9 and part of parcels 4, 6, and 7 of Block 245 be reserved for street purposes and a possible extension of Ottawa Street. The Board does not wish to delay the completion of the site plan phase. However, the Board does not believe sufficient informa-

tion is available to justify a recom-
mendation for a bridge over the Grand
River at Ottawa Street. The traffic
plan concept of the Board is to encour-
age cross town traffic to the north and
south of the Central Business District
and not through the heart of the Cen-
tral Business District. The Staff is pre-
sently conducting a study of this issue.
A report and recommendation will be
forthcoming upon the completion of
future traffic volume projections by
the Tri-County Regional Planning Com-
mission.

6. The detailed studies should be completed to resolve the Ottawa Street issue and the location of the City Market.
7. A program be initiated to revise the Master Plan for the City of Lansing as it pertains to this area.

Mr. Siebert arrived at 7:50 P.M.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino,
Reynolds and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Mr. Reynolds was excused from the
meeting by Chairman Bretz at 8:00 P.M.

HEARINGS

Z-35-68

No one appeared in regard to the peti-
tion to rezone property at 725, 727, 729
and 731 N. Larch Street and 730 and 732
N. Cedar Street, from "C-2" family to
"H" light industry.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Com-
mittee.

Z-38-68

No one appeared in regard to the peti-
tion to rezone property at the 4800 block
of Dunckel Road, from "A-1" to "D-1"
and "E-2" drive-in district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-39-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3214 N. East Street, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-41-68

The petitioner was present in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3003 E. Michigan Avenue, from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-44-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 5321 North Pennsylvania Avenue, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 8:10 P.M.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from the Ingham County Young Republicans, announcing a discussion on the City Income Tax, to take place on April 24, 1968 at 7:30 P.M. Received and placed on file.

MODEL CITIES

Mr. Guernsey stated that the Model Cities application had been forwarded to Washington and Chicago and that analysis of the application is now in progress. He stated that the approach used in the application is an analysis of both the physical and social conditions of the city. Charts were presented showing the Model Cities area, where the major share of low income and blighted homes are located; the open space areas in the city, of which there is a lack in the Central City, the living conditions in the Model Cities area; and a chart showing land use in the subject area.

Mr. Black, on behalf of the Board, complimented the Planning Department Staff very highly on the assembly of the Model Cities application, especially in the light of the short amount of time for prepara-

tion of the application. The charts contained within the application are very graphically and artistically produced and contain valuable information for the Board and the City of Lansing.

Mr. Fink and Mrs. Bretz supported Mr. Black's remarks and stated their appreciation of the Director and Staff for a job well done.

Recess 8:10 to 8:35 P.M.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-188-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition to rezone property at 1800, 1900 blocks Hoyt Street from "A-1" family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

The Board has given prior consideration to this petition and is therefore familiar with the purpose of this application. This item was considered by the Planning Board at previous meetings, and the recommendation was that the request be approved in principle, with the applicant being requested to submit detailed plans in accord with the Board's Planning unit development policy prior to final recommendation to City Council.

The applicant has now filed a letter with City Council requesting that the petition be amended, and that it be considered under the new "D-M:1" zoning district.

The Board submits the following comment and recommendation:

1. The plan was previously considered on a gross density not to exceed 12 units per acre appreciating that these densities were 8 and 12 respectively. This was felt to be reasonable, and would not contribute to over development of the land, and over load public utilities and facilities. The requested change would allow density increase to 14 dwelling units per acre, or a total increase of 78 and 72 units respectively.
2. "D-M:1" zoning would not permit any architectural controls, grading and landscaping and would allow for the development of conventional construction, which could detract from the aesthetic qualities that could be built into the area.
3. The percentage of land coverage regarding building and parking areas that is generally created by conventional development, could cause the need for increased sewer sizes, which in turn demands public expenditures.
4. Facilities in the area such as: parks, schools and potential shopping areas are available and lend themselves to family type development, which may not occur under straight zoning.

5. The Forest View Master Plan revision attempts to create a balanced Community while at the same time attempting to overcome the lack of aesthetic amenities prevalent in this area due, no doubt, in large part to its premature development. Conventional apartments otherwise not specifically family oriented could very well destroy the balanced community development the plan attempts to achieve.
6. The balanced community concept would indicate that housing units be preferably family oriented both for young family formation and older established family formations. This is difficult to achieve in garden type apartment buildings as opposed for instance to townhouses which are more conducive to family living. Apartments on the other hand when used for family accommodation experience rapid rates of deterioration.
7. Conventional apartment structures in the Forest View Community area may quite likely be used by young single persons three and four to an apartment and for this reason it would be a mistake to permit a large number of such units because this would upset the balance that the Master Plan attempts to achieve and would seriously lessen the appeal of this large only remaining area in Lansing for family use.
8. This kind of situation is irreversible and would likely commit the rest of the community to such development, the effect of which would be to seriously overload underground utilities and require their enlargement at tremendous cost to the city. For this reason the densities should be kept consistent with those projected in the Master Plan as they will form the basis for public decisions in respect of public utilities.
9. Lastly, overdevelopment of an area with conventional apartments particularly of the type that could be most expected in this neighborhood (namely lower income) will turn this area into a jungle of parking lots lacking any screening or other treatment, the lowest grade of landscape treatment and generally will result in an area which will lack any stability and urban design.

In summary we believe the overall development of the Forest View Community can only be as achieved by taking the position that the principle development emphasis should be upon achieving a balanced community and therefore multiple housing forms should be limited principally to townhouses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-192-66

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino that the petition to rezone property at 3206 Aurelius Road to Community Unit Plan be denied.

The Board has given prior consideration to this petition and is therefore familiar with the purpose of this application. This item was considered by the Planning Board at previous meetings, and the recommendation was that the request be approved in principle, with the applicant being requested to submit detailed plans in accord with the Board's Planned unit development policy prior to final recommendation to City Council.

The applicant has now filed a letter with City Council requesting that the petition be amended, and that it be considered under the new "D-M:1" zoning district.

The Board submits the following comment and recommendation:

1. The plan was previously considered on a gross density not to exceed 12 units per acre appreciating that these densities were 8 and 12 respectively. This was felt to be reasonable, and would not contribute to over development of the land, and over load public utilities and facilities. The requested change would allow a density increase to 14 dwelling units per acre, or a total increase of 78 and 72 units respectively.
2. "D-M:1" zoning would not permit us any architectural controls, grading and landscaping and would allow for the development of conventional construction, which could detract from the aesthetic qualities that could be built into the area.
3. The percentage of land coverage regarding building and parking areas that is generally created by conventional development, could cause the need for increased sewer sizes, which in turn demands public expenditures.
4. Facilities in the area such as; parks, schools and potential shopping area are available and lend themselves to family type development, which may not occur under straight zoning.
5. The Forest View Master Plan revision attempts to create a balanced Community while at the same time attempting to overcome the lack of aesthetic amenities prevalent in this area due, no doubt, in large to its premature development. Conventional apartments otherwise not specifically family oriented could very well destroy the balanced community development in plan attempts to achieve.
6. The balanced community concept would indicate that housing units be preferably family oriented both for young family formation and older established family formation. This is difficult to achieve in garden type apartment buildings as

opposed for instance to townhouses which are more conducive to family living. Apartments on the other hand when used for family accommodation experience rapid rates of deterioration.

7. Conventional apartment structures in the Forest View Community area may quite likely be used by young single persons three and four to an apartment and for this reasons it would be a mistake to permit a large number of such units because this would upset the balance that the Master Plan attempts to achieve and would seriously lessen the appeal of this large only remaining area in Lansing for family use.
8. This kind of situation is irreversible and would likely commit the rest of the community to such development, the effect of which would be to seriously overload underground utilities and require their enlargement at tremendous costs to the city. For this reason the densities should be kept consistent with those projected in the Master Plan as they will form the basis for public decisions in respect of public utilities.
9. Lastly, overdevelopment of an area with conventional apartments particularly of the type that could be most expected in this neighborhood (namely lower income) will turn this area into a jungle of parking lots lacking any screening or other treatment, the lowest grade of landscape treatment and generally will result in an area which will lack any stability and urban design.

In summary we believe the overall development of the Forest View Community can only be as achieved by taking the position that the principle development emphasis should be upon achieving a balanced community and therefore multiple housing forms should be limited principally to townhouses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-149-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 2800, 2900, 3000 blocks Aurelius Road and Ruth Street, from "A-1" family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

The Board has given prior consideration to this petition and is therefore familiar with the purpose of this application. This item was considered by the Planning Board at previous meetings, and the recommendation was that the request be approved in principle, with the applicant being requested to submit detailed plans in accord with the Board's Planned unit development policy prior to final recommendation to City Council.

The applicant has now filed a letter with City Council requesting that the petition be amended, and that it be considered under the new "D-M:1" zoning district.

The Board submits the following comment and recommendation:

1. The plan was previously considered on a gross density not to exceed 12 units per acre appreciating that these densities were 8 and 12 respectively. This was felt to be reasonable, and would not contribute to over development of the land, and over load public utilities and facilities. The requested change would allow a density increase to 14 dwelling units per acre, or a total increase of 78 and 72 units respectively.
2. "D-M:1" zoning would not permit us any architectural controls, grading and landscaping and would allow for the development of conventional construction, which could detract from the aesthetic qualities that could be built into the area.
3. The percentage of land coverage regarding building and parking areas that is generally created by conventional development, could cause the need for increased sewer sizes, which in turn demands public expenditures.
4. Facilities in the area such as; parks, schools and potential shopping area are available and lend themselves to family type development, which may not occur under straight zoning.
5. The Forest View Master Plan revision attempts to create a balanced Community while at the same time attempting to overcome the lack of aesthetic amenities prevalent in this area due, no doubt, in large part to its premature development. Conventional apartments otherwise not specifically family oriented could very well destroy the balanced community development the plan attempts to achieve.
6. The balanced community concept would indicate that housing units be preferably family oriented both for young family formation and older established family formations. This is difficult to achieve in garden type apartment buildings as opposed for instance to townhouses which are more conducive to family living. Apartments on the other hand when used for family accommodation experience rapid rates of deterioration.
7. Conventional apartment structures in the Forest View Community area may quite likely be used by young single persons three and four to an apartment and for this reasons it would be a mistake to permit a large number of such units because this would upset the balance that the Master Plan attempts to achieve and would seriously lessen the appeal of this large only remaining area in Lansing for family use.

8. This kind of situation is irreversible and would likely commit the rest of the community to such development, the effect of which would be to seriously overload underground utilities and require their enlargement at tremendous costs to the city. For this reason the densities should be kept consistent with those projected in the Master Plan as they will form the basis for public decisions in respect of public utilities.

9. Lastly, overdevelopment of an area with conventional apartments particularly of the type that could be most expected in this neighborhood (namely lower income) will turn this area into a jungle of parking lots lacking any screening or other treatment, the lowest grade of landscape treatment and generally will result in an area which will lack any stability and urban design.

In summary we believe the overall development of the Forest View Community can only be as achieved by taking the position that the principle development emphasis should be upon achieving a balanced community and therefore multiple housing forms should be limited principally to townhouses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-163-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Clayton and Francis Baxter, to rezone a parcel at 3418 Forest Road, from "A-1" family residential to "D-M" multiple Dwelling district be denied.

Due to the location of site with respect to existing storm and sanitary facilities, this request seems to be somewhat premature. The existing development is extremely spotty and it is unlikely that any further development will occur due to Michigan State University's policy regarding land acquisition.

If this request were granted, an island of development could occur which would be a substantial drain on public services such as police and fire protection. A more likely possibility is that Michigan State University will buy the property even if it is rezoned, but at an inflated price based on the zoning of the land.

At best this would be a spot zone totally unrelated to the existing or future land use plan for the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-168-67

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Louis Smith, Attorney, acting for Mr. and Mrs. John Murphy, to rezone a parcel at 4903 N. Grand River, from "E-2" drive-in to "E-1" drive-in be granted, subject to the removal of the overnight cabins.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-2-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the planning Board recommend that the request from Robert Gutterman, Urban American Land Development for approval of a Community Unit Plan in the 5900 block of South Washington Avenue more particularly described as a 10.5 acre site lying immediately north of Miller Road and east of Washington Avenue be denied.

The Board does not believe a variation from the single family development pattern would adversely affect the adjacent properties providing that:

The area south of Hein Avenue extended be developed into housing for the elderly with building coverage not to exceed 25% of the land area, with a maximum number of 4 units per building.

The area north of Hein Avenue be developed in single family homes adjacent to the existing single family development, and townhouses (if desired) on the balance of the area. Density of this portion of the project not to exceed 5 dwelling units per acre.

The property is platted, which reflects the necessary public right-of-ways and drain easements.

The Board would further recommend that we invite a Community Unit Plan based on the foregoing conditions, and further that:

The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's policy.

That the applicant would work out details of housing types, off-street parking, and site plan standards with the Planning Department.

That prior to formal submission of the required plans, the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-3-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mitchell Skory, to rezone a parcel at 901-905 Cleveland Street, from "B-1" residential to "F" commercial district be granted.

The site is scheduled to be acquired by the State Highway Department by 1972, for the future widening of Oakland Avenue. Due to this time factor (approximately four (4) years) the Board believes the property owner would be faced with an undue hardship if minor redevelopment of the land were prohibited.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Duncan—1.

Z-17-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Sigmund Kempler, to rezone a parcel at 600 W. Shiawassee, from "D" apartment to "D-1" professional district be denied.

The Central City Plan suggests that this area should be developed with apartments.

In support of this petition, the applicant argues that because of the clinic under construction on the adjacent property and because of the small size of his property, that apartments are not a reasonable use of his property. This argument implies that some land use advantage should be granted to these property owners whose property is smaller than normal. This philosophy carried to its logical conclusion would result in the chaotic intergration of residential and non-residential uses which characterizes much of the core area.

It should be pointed out that in accord with the existing regulations this property can be developed in the same manner as the adjacent property.

Admittedly, the construction of the clinic in the midst of a potential apartment district is not desirable. The Board has recommended that this provision, which allows an office building under the guise of a clinic, be delated from the permitted uses in the "D" apartment district. The Council, however, has not taken any action on this recommendation.

The Central City Plan has set aside many areas for offices and any change to permit offices or clinics outside these areas will weaken the market potential of those areas, as well as destroy the public confidence in the Central City Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Duncan—1.

Z-8-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the request for approval of a Community Unit Plan to permit the construction of housing for the elderly on the property located at 3200-3300 N. Larch Street and 500 Community Street be denied. The Board would give further consideration to a planned community unit development which addresses itself to the following:

Maximum density of eight to ten dwelling units per acre.

Single story "cottage" type units clustered in groups of four to six.

That the plan be designed to meet the objectives of the Board's adopted policy for Planned Unit Developments.

That the petitioner be encouraged to assemble a rear portion of the properties which abut the West line of site.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-9-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the request for approval of a community unit plan in the 3400 block of Turner Street more particularly described as 3.4 acres of land lying north of the properties on Fairfield Avenue and east of Turner Street be denied.

1. The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is predominately single family residential, and indiscriminate zoning and land use development could deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing regulations.
2. Elderly housing is also considered on the basis of facilities available, such as: commercial (shopping), parks which will provide both passive and active recreation, mass transportation, churches, libraries, theatres, etc. A review of the existing land use in the area does not reveal any of the above mentioned facilities.
3. There is a very pronounced difference between this site and the site under con-

sideration on North Larch Street. This site is located to the interior of an existing and potential residential area and would be completely out of character with existing development, where as the North Larch Street site is at the outer fringe of the residential area and is adjacent to existing and potential commercial development.

4. The Board would encourage the assembly of the subject property with the vacant land North to Sheridan Road which could then be given consideration on the basis of a planned unit development and include the necessary facilities, such as shopping, parks, churches, libraries, etc. Development of this nature would take into consideration existing development in the area and would be treated so as to provide a compatible land use relationship.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-20-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by T. G. McGurrian, Attorney, acting for Edward W. Sparrow Hospital, to rezone a parcel in the 219-223 North Holmes Street, described as:

Lots No. 6 and 7, Block C Gower's Addition

from "C-2" family to "J" parking district be granted, with screening along the North line of Lot 7 and the East line of Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Screening to consist of the following:

A three foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.

This request is the latest in a series which have been considered by the Planning Board and City Council, as the Sparrow Hospital continues to expand its off-street parking facilities. It is unfortunate that the expansion is occurring in a viable residential district which has remained stable for a number of years.

The intrusion of parking into the area is disruptive and the problem is amplified by the unsightliness of the parking lot. Field inspection of the site revealed that some cars were protruding over the sidewalk, some of the tire stops had been dislodged and were lying on the sidewalks, and the boulevard between the sidewalk and curb was not maintained.

The Board's previous recommendations, which were favorable were based on the belief that if proper screening, lighting and other improvements were provided the use

would not be detrimental to the area. After reviewing the site, it is apparent that sufficient screening has not been provided and the Board believes that any expansion should be conditioned upon erection of a three foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats along the North and East lines of the entire parking lots. This condition will protect the sidewalk and decrease the unsightliness of the lots.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-21-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Patrick J. Callihan, to rezone a parcel at 5300 S. Cedar Street, from "D-M" multiple dwelling to "F" commercial district be denied.

Perhaps a look at the history of this area will provide some insight as to how and why this area has developed the way it has and will provide a frame of reference by which a logical decision as to the merits of this application can be reached.

At the time of annexation, in the fall of 1960, a small shopping center had been developed at the southwest corner of Jolly and Cedar. Shortly thereafter a large area was zoned to permit expansion of the center southward along S. Cedar. The shopping center expanded in conformity with the zoning until last year when three parcels were served and sold to individual merchants. This action destroyed the character of this commercial district; one of the sites will be occupied by a drive-in bank which will not conform to the established setback. The other two are occupied by an appliance store and an auto wash. All have separate entrances, parking areas and all have requested individual signs.

It is unfortunate that the recognized principles of good shopping district design were abandoned in this area.

This application is a continuation of the strip or ribbon development which has begun on the property to the north. This in itself should be sufficient cause for denial, however, the application has some more ominous overtones. This parcel is part of a larger parcel which extends south along S. Cedar Street more than 500 feet. It is almost a certainty that this is the first of a series which if granted will ultimately commit the entire property to commercial use. If this situation does occur it is unlikely that any public access to the interior will be provided. (It should be noted that previous determination of the Board and City Council have demonstrated the necessity of having public access from Cedar Street to the interior somewhere in this area).

On the other hand the existing zoning permits a rather high density of residential occupancy, a use which would support the existing commercial district.

There are no substantial reasons why the property cannot be used in accord with the existing zoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-22-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by G. R. Wellman, Vice-President of Bank of Lansing, to rezone a parcel at 5226 S. Cedar Street, from "J" parking to "F" commercial district be denied.

The Planning Board believes the change will establish a precedent beyond what the shopping center standards were designed for.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus and Heino—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Siebert—1.

Z-23-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Louis A. Smith, acting for D. Granger, to rezone a parcel at 5601 S. Cedar Street, from "G-2" wholesale to "H" light industrial district be denied.

The subject property and the surrounding development was developed while in the township. After annexation in 1960 the area has been rezoned on a piecemeal, individual parcel basis without benefit of a detailed plan. As a result, the zoning districts are arranged in a crazy-quilt pattern which permits the whole range of land uses to occur in highly sensitive places.

The subject property is typical in that a developed single family residential district abuts the rear line of the property. While it may be argued that the proposed use could be effectively screened from the residential district, no amount of screening will protect the residences from the adverse effects of many manufacturing uses which would be permitted should the request be granted. There is no guarantee that the use will be limited to automobile engine repair. It is a distinct possibility

that the use will be more intensive than proposed.

The basic dilemma lies in the antiquated zoning ordinance with which we must contend. The proposed use, in modern zoning ordinances, is permitted in heavy commercial districts rather than manufacturing districts. If this were the case this application could be viewed in an entirely different light.

The property is being used in conformance with the existing zoning and there are no substantial reasons why it cannot continue to be used. A change of intensity will only further isolate the residential district which is already subject to increased pressures from the high density development occurring to the east.

The use requested should be located in an industrial development such as one of the industrial parks rather than as a spot industrial use, located on a major entrance to the city.

Petition containing twenty-four (24) names submitted in objection to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-24-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Lee Halstead from "A-1" family to "C-2" district be denied.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Heino, that the petition be tabled.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-25-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Philip G. Walter, acting for Wolverine Commercial Corp., to rezone a parcel at 5931 S. Cedar, 5920 Joshua and 625 Dellen Streets described as:

Lots 35, 36, 37 and 39, Dellen Street of Supervisor's Plat No. 3 Delhi Twp. also Lots 21, 22, and 23 and Dellen Street extended west to the east line of the old Michigan Urban Railway of Latham Heights Subdivision. Also commencing on the east line of Section four 579.2 feet north of the S.E. corner of Section and thence west 136.40 feet; thence south 232.00 feet; thence east 136.40 feet to the east section line; thence north 230.00 feet

to the point of beginning. All being Section 4, T3N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family residential to "G-2" wholesale district be denied.

The property under consideration is unique in the sense that this is one of the few areas along S. Cedar Street that is not exposed directly to Cedar Street, and is protected from the adverse influences of traffic and activity by a service road.

A change of zoning as requested may foster uncontrolled development through the established residential area, and may adversely affect property values in the vicinity and deter their improvement or development in accord with the existing regulations.

The Board does not believe there are any substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in a residential nature.

The Master Land Use Plan indicates residential development for the area, with the Community Renewal survey indicating existing development to be relatively stable.

Commercial and industrial development in an uncoordinated manner along major arterial streets seriously impairs the ability of the street to move traffic efficiently, often necessitating public expenditures for widening which would not have been necessary if these uses were clustered around industrial parks with channelized access points to the major road system.

Petition containing thirty-five (35) signatures was submitted in objection to the proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-26-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at the 2710-2714 S. Cedar Street described as:

Com. on the West line of South Cedar St. 10 rods South of the East and West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of Section 28, thence West 16 rods, South $3\frac{1}{2}$ rods, East 16 rods, North to beginning except the West 33 feet thereof and also commencing West line South Cedar St. $13\frac{1}{2}$ rods South of the West and East $\frac{1}{4}$ line Section 28, thence South 82.5 feet to North line of Willard St., West 369.6 feet, North 140.25 feet, East 105.6 feet to point 16 rods West of West line of South Cedar St., South 57.75 feet East 264 feet to beginning, except the West 138.6 feet thereof, Section 28, T4N,

R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family to "D-1" professional district be granted.

The site under consideration is one of the few properties along the area of South Cedar Street that has retained its residential characteristics and zoning. This is not to say that the existing situation is desirable nor would it be reasonable to expect the property to redevelop in a residential nature.

The property falls within an area that is indicated as general commercial on the Master Land Use Plan and it is the opinion of the Board that; a change as proposed will encourage redevelopment of the property with the least adverse affect on the adjacent land use and will not excessively increase traffic congestion.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—7.

Nays: None.

Z-29-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Louis Smith, acting for Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Love, to rezone a parcel at 821-829 N. Chestnut, from "C-2" family to "D-M" multiple dwelling district be denied.

The property under consideration is located within an area that is proposed for garden apartments-multi-family two story townhouse type development and as indicated on the Central City Development Plan. The projected density for this type of development would range from 10-20 dwelling units per acre. The present density of the block in which the subject property is located is approximately 13 units per acre. Due to the bulk and spacing of structural development adequate light, air, and open space has been reduced to a minimum. "D-M" multiple dwelling districts permit 29 dwelling units per acre.

A change of zoning as requested would allow development at a density in excess of the Central City Plan, and negate the possibility of any further development occurring in accordance with the proposed development plan.

The existing land use in this area consists of one, two, and three family dwellings. Indiscriminate zoning and land use development as proposed would introduce additional traffic and activity into the area, and could deter the improvement or development of adjacent properties in accord with existing regulations.

The prerequisite to any zoning changes in this area should be the assembly of

larger tracts of land, which will promote development in accord with the Central City Plan.

It is further pointed out that the existing density in this block (13 dwelling units per acre) is as high a density the Board would recommend on an overall change.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert--7.

Nays: None.

Z-30-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Walter Levandowski, to rezone a parcel in the 1100 block Jolly Road and 4900-5000 block S. Logan, described as:

Supervisor's Plat No.4, Lots 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and Briarfield, Lots 1, 2, 3, and 4, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family, "J" parking and "F" commercial to "F" commercial district be denied as filed and recommend "F" commercial and "J" parking district subject to the developer submitting a site plan reflecting the following:

1. a. Location of buildings and off street parking. Parking to be provided at a ratio of 3 square feet of parking area for every one square foot of building area.
- b. Points of Ingress and egress to the site.
- c. Areas designated for loading and unloading.
- d. Landscaping of the entire site.
2. Screening to be provided along the west property line.
3. Lighting of the parking area to be provided at a minimum of 2/10 lumens light per square feet.
4. Adequate set-backs from Logan Street which will insure clear vision for automobile traffic, and reduce congestion in streets.

The site under consideration is what one might consider as being partially developed. The Master Land Use indicates a neighborhood shopping center at this location consisting of approximately 4 acres with a variety of approximately 5 stores.

The existing zoning limits expansion to this degree and prohibits any possibility of rearranging the existing development which the developer has proposed.

The site does have ease of access to two major streets, and the physical features of the land (Gilky Drain) cause separation from the established residential development.

Adequate facilities should be provided for off-street parking and off-street loading either by private or public interests. The site plan submitted which indicates the existing and proposed building development could pose some problems in this respect. Building development is crowded to the westerly property line and leaves very little room for service vehicles to the rear.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert--7.

Nays: None.

Mr. Reynolds returned to the meeting at 9:45 P.M.

Z-31-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Donald Hines, attorney, acting for Oldsmobile Division, to rezone a portion of Elm Street to "I" heavy industrial district be granted.

The parcel in question has lost its significance as a public street due to the surrounding development. Based on this factor the Planning Board recommended the vacating of this portion of Elm Street subject to full width utility easement, at their meeting of March 19, 1968.

The Master Land Use Plan indicated this area as industrial with proposed expansion north to Main Street.

Therefore the requested change in zoning is in conformance with the overall plan and will not affect any adjoining property or the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Siebert--7.

Nays: None.

Z-40-68

Motion by Siebert, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition to D. G. Eberly to rezone a parcel in the 3214 North East Street, described as:

Lots No. 5, 6, and 7 except the East 47 feet of Lot No. 5, East Street Sub-division of a part of the N.W. ¼ of Section 3, Town 4, North Range 2

West, Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" family to "F" commercial district, be denied as filed and recommends that portion of the property described as:

The West 52 ft. of Lots 6 and 7, the West 20 ft. of the East 67 ft. of Lot 5, also that portion of Lots 5, 6, and 7 described as; comm. 67 ft. West of the southeast corner of Lot 5, thence West 81 ft., thence North 231 ft., thence East 20 ft., thence South 201 ft., thence East 61 ft., thence South 30 ft. to beginning

be rezoned from "A-1" family to "J" parking, and the balance of Lots 5, 6, and 7 be rezoned from "A-1" family to "F" commercial. All property be part of East Street Subdivision, City of Lansing.

At the present time fencing consisting of a chain link fence and board fence, exists along the East boundary of the property under consideration. With the addition of dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in. provided along the East line of Lot 6 and 7 adequate screening will be provided for.

The Board would further recommend that if the existing fencing is for any reason removed, or destroyed one of the following types shall be provided along the East property line except for a 20 ft. set-back on Community Street.

1. A 6 ft. high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats.
2. A 3 ft. high chain link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.
3. Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the property owner, with the approval of the Planning Board.

Lighting of the parking areas to be provided at a minimum of 2/10 lumens per square feet, so directed on the parking area as not to affect adjacent properties or passing motorists.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino and Siebert—6.

Nays: Fink—1.

Abstain: Reynolds—1.

STREETS COMMITTEE

S-7-62P Bancroft Hills Subdivision

Preliminary Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the request for an amendment to the preliminary plat of Bancroft Hills be approved.

This approval is to be granted subject to all previous conditions of approval.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

SS-43-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council, that the request to vacate a section of Everett Lane between Willard Avenue and Hodge Avenue be approved at such time as Willard Avenue is extended to Stabler Street. Further that the vacation of Everett Lane between Hodge Avenue and Paris Avenue also be reviewed at such time to determine how such vacation could be accomplished while not creating a hardship for any property owner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

ROW-6-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request to vacate that section of Wyllis Street located between North Grand River and Capitol Avenue be approved.

This street has never been opened or improved and there are no storm or sanitary sewers, water, or gas mains in this area. All public utilities and City Departments approve this street vacation. All abutting property owners have signed the petition to vacate.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-9-67F Southland Plaza Final

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the Final Plat of Southland Plaza be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalk\$10,150

Curb and Gutter 6,770

Monuments	500
Gravel	3,000
Storm Sewer	13,000
Sanitary Sewer	12,000
Total	\$45,420

2. That the necessary easements for electric service be provided.
3. All lots be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

S-13-65 F-3 Scotsdale No. 3 Final Plat

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the final plat of Scotsdale No. 3 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalk	\$14,700
Curb and Gutter	10,000
Monuments	1,200
Gravel	6,000
Storm Sewer	22,500
Sanitary Sewer	31,000
Total	\$85,400

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

2. That the required easement for electric service be provided.
3. All lots be graded so that storm water will drain to the street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Fink reported that the Executive Committee had discussed at their recent

meeting the quandry of the Planning Board in regard to the availability of six Board members to provide a recommendation to City Council. In view of the recent failure of the Board to pass a revision to the Planning Board Policy and Procedures to allow five votes for a recommendation to City Council, we request the Board to consider the following recommendation.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the City Charter be revised to permit the appointment of nine members to the Lansing Planning Board. It is further recommended that this matter be placed on the next ballot available, without a special election being involved.

Mr. Siebert questioned whether the above recommendation would change the fact that six votes are required for a recommendation to City Council.

Mr. Duncan stated that if the Charter change were effective, it might be germane to also include the alternation of the Rules of Procedure to allow five members to carry on until City Council acts on the recommendation to change the membership of the Board to nine members. Perhaps a rule change for a short period of time until a Charter revision can be voted upon.

Mr. Black stated he did not think this view was valid for two reasons: 1) it assumes the public will adopt the Charter change; and 2) it seems to assume it would be a long time until nine members could be implemented. This could possibly be on the ballot in August. There does not seem to be any necessity for a temporary change in the Rules of Procedure particularly since it carries a legal implication with it.

Mr. Fink questioned the number of members on Planning Board in cities the size of Lansing.

The Director stated this matter would be researched and a report would be available to the Board at their next meeting.

Further discussion followed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds and Siebert—8.

Nays: None.

Meeting adjourned at 11:48 P.M.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSTEY,
Secretary.

B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, May 21, 1968

Maple Grove Community Hall
5647 Hughes Road

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert—5.

Absent: Black, Duncan, Fink—3.

Mrs. Bretz welcomed those present and introduced the Planning Board members and the Planning Department staff to the audience.

P-3-68 Fredericksburg, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Fountain, Planning staff, discussed the location, stating that the property, which consists of four acres, will be divided into 8 lots, averaging 20,000 square feet and having a frontage on Raymond Drive Extended. He cited the land use in the vicinity of the subject property.

Mr. Larry Daggett, equal owner with Victor Rothburg, spoke in behalf of the proposed development. He stated there was 5.2 acres to be divided into eight lots.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

SS-14-67 South Logan Street Zoning Policy

Mr. Nino of the Planning staff gave a slide presentation showing the present conditions on S. Logan Street pointing out what could happen in the future—using S. Cedar Street as an example of the absence of regulations for development.

Mr. Fountain discussed the location and character of each slide on S. Cedar Street. He pointed out the excessive number of advertising signs, curb cuts, the traffic hazard, the strip commercial development, and the absence of regulated setbacks.

Mr. Nino stated that the majority of facilities on S. Cedar Street are not the type of facility which serve the immediate residential neighborhood. There is a considerable amount of similarity between S. Logan and S. Cedar St. He emphasized

that S. Cedar Street could carry twice the volume of traffic it now moves if it had been properly planned.

Mr. Guernsey, Planning Director, discussed the purpose of the proposed South Logan Street Zoning Policy. The slides have shown what could happen on S. Logan Street. We believe there should be a reasonable use of the land. Mr. Guernsey explained the position of the City Council on this matter, saying that the Council has reviewed this proposed plan and while not wholly agreeing with the proposal, have directed the Planning Board and staff to proceed with the development of an overall plan concept which they can then adopt as official policy, which would be the guiding rule for rezoning in the subject area. Once a plan is adopted it must be followed and not varied from due to individual pressures of property or other vested interest. The Council has expressed its concern to retain those functions which involve convenience items serving the neighborhood area, such as a barber shop or neighborhood grocery store. Concern also has been expressed for a proper period of amortization. The plan by the Board recommends that the plan be carried out over a three year period and the Council did not agree, but suggested that this be phased out over a longer period of time—perhaps ten years. The Planning Board believes that the aid of those residents in the subject area is very necessary for the formulation of the final submission to the City Council. The purpose of the Board's presence is to develop a logical plan for the development of your Community.

Mr. Nino discussed the South Logan Street Zoning Policy Plan as originally submitted to the City Council. He described the method of determining such a plan. Present uses and proposed uses were discussed.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 8:20 p.m.

Strip commercial versus grouped concentrations was discussed by Mr. Nino. A schematic drawing of what could be done on a typical piece of property on South Logan Street was shown.

Max Green, owner of the monument

company on South Logan Street, spoke in support of the proposed plan. He questioned if the City can legally buy and sell this property without a vote of the people? Mr. Guernsey replied that the City is empowered to be able to acquire property at a fair market value and could resell it. Mr. Green asked where the money would come from for the City to buy the property? Mr. Guernsey replied that City Council could appropriate funds over a period of years for acquisition of the property. The State law provides that an assessment district could be set up if desired. The Planning Board proposes it should be done out of the general fund on an overall City-wide basis. Mr. Green thought there were too many places proposed to be phased out.

Mr. Green stated he owned property now zoned commercial. He checked on the possibility of moving his business into a shopping center but the cost is prohibitive. Would the City let him expand his business on his present site. Mr. Guernsey stated that the City Council has not adopted the plan. It will take time to work out further details. It is not intended that the City do the development. Mr. Green stated he wants his business left where it is. Mrs. Bretz stressed that specific problems of this type cannot be answered at this time.

Doug Bartram, owner of the archery shop on S. Logan St., stated his is the only archery shop within the City. They are now in a position where expansion of the business is necessary. They have filed a petition for this purpose. If they are not allowed to expand on their present site, they will either have to go out of business or move to another location. The shopping center cost is prohibitive. Can the City stop a person from expanding without being rezoned for commercial purposes. Those within a commercial zone would be able to expand.

Richard Beltz, resident on West Miller Road, questioned the rationale of zoning commercial the property on the corner of West Miller Road and South Logan Street. Mr. Nino explained that if the proposed plan were implemented through zoning, eventually businesses may move themselves out because of an inability to expand their uses on their present site. The area south of Miller to the expressway could possibly be an area for this commercial relocation. It could be a cluster of commercial uses. Mr. Beltz questioned if this wouldn't just be shifting the problem from one place to another or is it intended that this would be developed so that it would not affect the surrounding area. What guarantee would the surrounding property owners have? Mr. Nino replied if businesses would cluster properly together with adequate screening, adequate off-street parking, proper directional points to the arterial streets, there would not affect any abutting residential property, not to the same degree as they are now affecting residences as they scattered along Logan Street. Mr. Beltz questioned the corner of Miller and

Logan which is now single family being designated for multiple dwelling. Mr. Nino stated that this is a dangerous intersection. The plan is trying to create a street diversion which will eliminate the five way intersection. The density proposed for this is from 10 to 20 dwelling units to the acre.

Further discussion followed.

Arthur Pylar, 5235 Hughes Road, remarked that it is very expensive for businesses to move from their present sites into a center or cluster. Will the City provide a lower rent area for them? Mr. Guernsey replied that the City would prefer that the plan be followed and be carried out by private enterprise. They would, however, provide relocation assistance as much as they are able. Mr. Pylar stated that the Community would be at a loss if these businesses were to move.

Jim Covello, property owner at 4100 block of South Logan, questioned how the businesses would be purchased that are non-conforming uses. Mr. Guernsey replied that if the City were involved in the acquisition of the property it would be at fair market value based on whatever use is there. Mr. Covello questioned the possibilities of expansion of the small businesses on their present sites, rather than relocation. He thought the amount of traffic on S. Logan would be prohibitive for residential development. He pointed out that those businesses that want to stay in business on S. Logan, with the rules and regulations for development as they are now, could be orderly expanded without all this relocation.

Leslie Kitchen, 3822 S. Logan, owner of heating business for over 30 years on S. Logan. When the store was built, it was set back from the road, but the road has been widened to the point where all he has is a parking space out in front. No land is available adjacent to the store, so I don't know what I am going to do. A group of those present met a few weeks ago regarding this type of problem. We have large investments out here. Is S. Logan Street going to be widened again? Mr. Guernsey replied this would be checked.

Mike Holmes, resident on S. Logan, bought our home with the intention of having flower business on the premises. My property is proposed by this plan to be phased out. What is classified as a service to remain on this street to serve this Community? In annexation to the City most businesses on the street that were commercial were rezoned to A-1 family. Who was supposed to notify the merchants of this fact? Mr. Guernsey replied that there is no formal notification when annexation occurs. The City Ordinance is based upon State law in regard to annexation. The purpose of the revision of the property to A-1 is just the purpose of what is going on tonight. We are trying to work with the property owners in the area to develop a plan which considers both your interest and the Community's interests.

Mr. East, 5508 S. Logan Street, bought his property before checking on it. He assumed it was commercial or apartment use, later found out it was zoned A-1. I bought the property with the idea of development of apartments, which I now find it would be about five years. The archery shop cannot expand or sell out now. He is at a standstill. Can't City go along with temporary zoning in this type of instance.

Mrs. Bretz complimented Mr. East on his suggestion of temporary rezonings.

Mr. Guernsey questioned his proposed density. Mr. East replied about 20 units, if sewers were extended. Further discussion followed.

John Rashid, interest at 5141 S. Logan asked if this type of plan had been tried before anywhere in Lansing. Mrs. Bretz replied it had not. Mr. Rashid asked if these could be a ceiling on the price of the property designated for commercial for protection of those who must relocate.

Bill Starr, property owner on Jolly, asked if Jolly is planned to be widened within the next few years? Mr. Guernsey replied this is planned for in the CIP Program. It is to be a major street.

Phil Walter, property manager for Wolverine Commercial Development Corporation, own S.W. corner of Logan and Mary Street. Mr. Walter questioned the real prospect of relocation for the small business people. Stated very serious thought should be given to this matter before implementation. Putting so much of S. Logan into multiple will require restrictions, which could also be done for commercial uses.

Property owner at 818 S. Logan Street was informed that she had been improperly notified that her property was not in the subject area being discussed.

Mrs. Michael Holmes 3912 S. Logan Street pointed out that S. Logan Street has one more lane and the lanes are wider than S. Cedar Street. She also asked if there were any statistics on the businesses downtown that had to relocate because of urban renewal projects.

Albert Schultz, Reo Road, President of the ICCL Falcon Archers, sponsors of five archery leagues, stated that the Maple Grove Archery needs to be expanded. Ten years is quite a period of time for this group to exist elsewhere if we are to be relocated. Mr. Guernsey stated that steps could be taken to aid individual properties in situations such as this through temporary rezonings or some other process.

James Welton, Ora Street, questioned if so much of this property is zoned D-M multiple, and the businesses have to relocate out further, you would still have the traffic problem. Do not like townhouses which go off the State tax rolls after three years and then my taxes go up. Discussion followed.

Charles J. Randall, Randall Electric, 5614 S. Logan Street stated he thought someone on the Board made the statement that all the businesses on S. Logan would be wiped out. Mrs. Bretz stated she was not aware of this.

Tim Totten, 1210 Warwick Drive, stated his residence was hemmed in by commercial build up. Think commercial development should be spread out. There are 22 curb cuts off Logan Street by a major intersection. No decent outlot from Warwick. Can the State regulate how this property will be used in the future and can the City make the businesses there now clean up their premises.

Floyd Decker, 2905 N. Hagadorn Road, asked if this plan is adopted by the Council will the property be condemned? Mr. Guernsey replied that at this point no plan exists to condemn all the properties. This could be done at a future time. Mr. Decker questioned the legality of condemnation process and the right of the individual property owner.

Alma Hinkle, 5921 Woodgate, stated she thought they were fortunate to have such fine people (Planning Board) to look after them. She stated she lived next to a commercial property which has devaluated her property. What can an individual property owner do to protect herself against devaluation by commercial properties. Mrs. Hinkle stated she would be glad to sell her property to a business that is in need of it. Property owner at 5333 South Logan stated her home was between two business establishments. She is definitely in accord with some sort of planning for S. Logan.

Mrs. Cook, Annetta Road, asked about the Edgewood extension date.

Anthony P. Nosal, 3703 Waverly Hill, addressed the Board regarding his concern as a citizen about the proposed plan for South Logan Street.

Mrs. Box, owner of machine shop on South Logan Street, stated that their shop was one of those proposed to be phased out. They have contacted real estate people with the thought of relocation in mind. Have found out that it would be financially impossible for them to do so. Have been on present site for eleven years. It takes time to establish a clientele. Mrs. Bretz stressed the fact that this is a tentative plan.

Councilman Louis Adado stated that when this proposal was presented by the Planning staff to the City Council for our consideration we asked precisely the questions that are being asked tonight. This was just a study point, you have to start someplace. Mr. Guernsey's staff went out to Logan Street and looked the situation over. They thought in their planning mind-what would be the best use for the land around the Logan Street area from Holmes south to I-96. This was put into booklet form so that the rest of the Councilmen, that are not familiar with this area, would know what it is like. If the

people that have this book would have read on to the alternatives they would have seen that this was not concrete, this was just an idea. Information was taken off the tax rolls as to the value of the property, and granted they are low, it wasn't long after this was published, that Mr. Kitchen called me and asked me to meet with him and some other businessmen to discuss this policy. We did this and I then asked for this open meeting, which had already been set up by the Planning Department. This is not being forced upon you people, we could have passed this at Council level without your knowledge, but this is not what we are elected for, not what we are trying to do. We are trying to work with you. Some persons would like to develop their land into multiple. In order to do this you have to file a rezoning petition for consideration of your property. If vacant land is zoned D-M:1 it does not cost the \$100 to have the multiple. We realize that barber shops, grocery stores, gas stations, etc., are necessary in

other than shopping center areas. This is being considered. Don't try to fight this. We need your help through meetings of this type. Taxes are controlled by State law. This is your Community and City as well as ours. These Board members give a lot of their time with no remuneration. They need your help not condemnation. If we all work together we can make Logan Street a street to be proud of.

Discussion followed.

Leslie Kitchen thanked Mr. Adado for meeting with those in the area. Also thanked the Planning Board for the open meeting. He did not ask for that first meeting to start trouble, rather for information.

There were approximately seventeen business owners present and approximately twenty-two homeowners present.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 7, 1968

Meeting called to order by Vice-Chairman Russell at 7:30 P.M.

Present: Mrs. Borgman, Messrs. Faggion, Hack, Russell, Saenz—5.

Absent: Messrs. Granger, Mosher, Tietz—3.

Minutes of the previous meeting were approved as printed.

GENERAL BUSINESS

Referral from the City Council of a letter from the Frandor Merchants Association regarding flooding situation.

Referred to Committee on Waste Disposal and Director.

Referral from the City Council of a letter from Roger Zeef regarding grading of Delta River Drive.

Letter to Mr. Zeef from Director approved by the Board.

Referral from the City Council of a petition from property owners on Sanford and Fredericks Streets for corrections to sewage system in the area.

Referred to Committee on Waste Disposal and City Engineer.

Committee on Personnel reported on meeting with City Personnel Director regarding job classification analysis.

Report from the Committee on Waste Disposal recommending to the City Council that they notify the Michigan Water Resources Commission that it is the intent of the Public Service Department to comply with the Commission's directive to remove at least 80% of phosphorous compounds from our waste water plant effluent by December of 1972.

Motion by Mr. Faggion supported by Mr. Hack that the report of the Committee be approved.

Carried.

Mr. Edward Malkowski, City Hall Maintenance Supervisor met with the Board and discussed operation of the City Hall and Police Buildings.

After discussion, the matter of study and revision of the City Weed Cutting Ordinance was referred to the Committee on Streets and Sidewalks.

Letter from Chief of Police to Public Service Director regarding Police Board resolution.

Referred to Director to answer.

Director of Public Service reported on various contracts and projects now under construction and their progress.

Meeting adjourned at 8:37 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM C. WAIDELICH,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, May 7, 1968

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Ramona Bretz, at 7:45 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—5.

Absent: Duncan, Fink, Siebert—3.

HEARINGS

Z-45-68

Larry Fowler, 505 Stoddard Building, developer, appeared on behalf of the petition to rezone property at the southeast corner of Miller and Grovenberg Roads. He described the land use in the surrounding area, stating he thought the proposed use would serve as a buffer between the commercial and the residential in the area.

Mr. Heino questioned the parking as stated in the site plan which allows 1.5 parking spaces per unit.

Mr. Fowler replied this has been changed to provide 2 spaces per unit.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-46-68

The petitioner was not present in behalf

of the petition to rezone property at 933 Northrup and adjacent property from A-1 family to C-2 family district.

Mr. Henry Lambracht, 1003 Mel Avenue questioned the Board's notification procedures on this rezoning, and stated subject area had enough multiple dwellings, and that he is opposed to the proposed rezoning.

Robert Hicks, 901 Northrup, stated he had not been notified of this hearing.

Hal Horton, title holder of property at 828 Northrup, spoke in objection to the rezoning in behalf of buyers of property at 828 Northrup.

Michael Fickies, 906 W. Northrup asked who the developer was, and pointed out that if it wasn't important enough for the developer to be present then the property should be left residential. He stated he was opposed to the proposed rezoning due to the number of multiple dwellings now in the area, the overcrowded school, and traffic conditions at present. He asked if Northrup Street is slated to be widened.

Mr. Guernsey replied there would be about an 80 ft. right-of-way, the pavement width would vary.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that the proposed rezoning request is for C-2 Family, which is a two-family dwelling, not an apartment complex.

Marsha Detloff, 853 Northrup, spoke in objection.

Mr. Vercruysse, the developer, stated he proposes a two-family unit on each side of his own home. The other property is proposed to be sold. Plan on building a colonial two-family, three bedroom home, with basement.

Property owner on the south west corner of Northrup and Washington Road stated he thought the school district was overcrowded and any more multiple dwellings would further overtax the school situation.

Fred Hanneman, 5618 S. Washington, Mrs. Charles Arsman, Northrup Street and Robert Hicks spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Approximately 20 persons were present in regard to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-47-68

Mr. Larry Bowles, 20th Century Buildings, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at south of 5715 South Washington from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple-Dwelling District. He stated that two twenty-one unit buildings were proposed on the site, with 54 parking spaces proposed for each building.

Mr. Crissey, 5904 Kyes Road presented a petition containing 128 signatures in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Crissey read the following letter stating objections:

May 7, 1968

Planning Board

City of Lansing

Gentlemen:

We the undersigned property owners, would like to take this opportunity to present our objections to the proposed rezoning of a parcel of land, located south of 5715 S. Washington Rd., from A-1 Residential to D-M Multiple Dwelling.

In presenting our objections to this rezoning petition it would have been very easy to resort to emotional rationalization rather than facts. However this would not be good business practice, would have been an insult to your intelligence and would consume an excessive amount of all parties valuable time.

We would therefore like to submit the following points for your consideration, while deliberating the proposed rezoning.

1. Approval of the petition and the subsequent development would be economical-

ly detrimental to the surrounding properties.

2. All surrounding parcels of land are zoned A-1 Residential and the established land use pattern in this area is single family residential.
3. The City of Lansing Master Plan indicates the planned usage of this land is for single family residences.
4. Approval of the petition would create an isolated high density living complex, with 15.5 units per acre, as opposed to the nominal single family residential density of 4 to 5 units per acre.
5. Approval of this petition would create an isolated district and encourage other developers to seek the same privilege for similar properties throughout the City.
6. There are no apparent justifiable reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with the surrounding properties and within the restrictions of its present zoning.
7. While we realize that a lack of adequate primary school facilities is not of itself a justification for denial of the petition in question, we feel that it should be noted that development of this complex would substantially add to the already overburdened facilities of Attwood School.

In conclusion, it is our adamant belief that thoughtful consideration of the aforementioned facts will make it impossible for you to allot even cursory consideration to the petition in question and we therefore petition the Board for submission of a unanimous recommendation of denial.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ DAVID J. CRISSEY,
For the Attached Petitioners;

Mr. Leon Lenneman, Jack Kinneman, 5729 S. Washington, and Kenneth McNutt, 5625 Schafer Road spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 8:15 p.m.

Z-48-68

Sam Rizizzi appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at the 5800 block of Joshua Street from A-1 Family to C-2 Family District.

Alvin Yerke, 5716 Joshua Street, Robert Simons, 5819 Joshua Street, and Donald Hicks, 5730 Joshua Street, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment, on the basis that there are sufficient multiple dwellings now in that area.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-49-68

Mr. Reamer Wigle, attorney representing the petitioner, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3109 W. Miller Road from A-1 family to D-M:1 multiple district. He stated the proposed use would improve the area, that there is a need for the proposed use. A plot plan and building sketches will be furnished to the Planning Department soon.

Mr. McNutt, 5625 Schafer Road questioned the number of units proposed.

Mr. Wigle replied approximately seventy units on the subject property.

Mr. Guernsey asked if the petitioner owned the land immediately to the south and was informed that the petitioner plans to try to acquire that land.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-50-68

Mr. Michael Stafford, attorney representing the petitioner, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3700-3800 blocks of Delta River Drive from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple and C-2 Family Districts. He stated that the subject property was not salable for single family development, due to land use in the area. Delta River is slated to be widened due to amount of traffic. Asking that Lots 1 and 2 be rezoned to D-M Multiple to permit construction of an apartment house. Lots 5 and 6 proposed for C-2 Family for duplexes. Proposed construction would not detract from surrounding property values. Submitted to Board pictures of type of buildings proposed.

Lloyd Hawkins, 1424 Shannan Lane, Eaton County, speaking for St. Stephens Lutheran Church, stated the church had passed a resolution in objection to the D-M Multiple proposed on the basis it does not conform in the area, and also stating that they are not opposed to the duplexes proposed for lots 5 and 6.

Mr. Charles Pierson, 3011 Arcadia Drive, representing a group of neighbors in the area spoke in objection, stating they wanted to keep this area single-family. Also stated he did not receive notification of this hearing.

Mr. Rolland Smith submitted to the Board building restrictions which state that only single-family can be built on this property. Mr. Smith spoke in opposition of this proposal. Received and placed on file. He stated he was also speaking for the Charles Woodruffs' who are in opposition of the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Sam Buck, 3005 Arcadia, William Birkholz, 3715 Delta River Drive, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Mr. Black stated he had a phone call from Mrs. Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Drive, who asked if he would register vehement protest regarding this proposed rezoning in their behalf, since they would be out of town at the time of this hearing.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-51-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 2620 and 2634 N. Grand River Avenue from F Commercial and J Parking to E-2 Drive in Shop.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-52-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1933 W. Holmes Road from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple Dwelling District.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-53-68

Mr. Bob Hubble, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the 5300 block of Oranger Drive from A-1 Family to D-M:1 Multiple District. Propose erection of 10 separate four family units. Spoke in regard to land use in area which is not conducive to single family homes.

Mr. Richard Bailey, 5310 Glenwood, spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

A petition in opposition to this rezoning, containing 147 signatures, was submitted by Mr. Bailey. Received and placed on file.

Mr. Robert Bair, 5326 Glenwood, spoke in opposition.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-54-68

Duane Reese, 820 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 816-820 N. Pennsylvania Avenue from C-2 Family to D-M Multiple or D-M:1 District. Mr. Reese stated they intend to sell the property, subject to the rezoning.

Mr. Joseph Sloan, owner of adjacent property, spoke in support of the proposed

amendment saying they prefer D-M:1 District rather than the D-M.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. Fink arrived at 9:10 p.m.

Motion by Black seconded by Gaus that Mr. Siebert be officially excused from this meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Recess 9:15 to 9:40 p.m.

HEARINGS SET

SS-14-67

Motion by Fink supported by Heino that the public hearing on the South Logan Zoning Policy be held at the Maple Grove Community Center on May 21, 1968 at 7:30 p.m.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black seconded by Gaus that the public hearing on Fredricksburg Subdivision be held on May 21, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Black seconded by Gaus that the minutes of March 5, 1968 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-167-64

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommends that the request from James Fox to amend a portion of the Community Unit Plan known as Cambridge Manor, lying south of Sandhurst Drive, be approved subject to:

1. Arrangement of off-street parking and design standards to be worked out with the Planning staff prior to recommendation to City Council.
2. That a landscape plan be submitted and approved prior to issuance of building permits.

The Board reviewed the proposed plans regarding the changes, and do not believe the change in architectural style will have

any adverse effect on the existing development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-168-67

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that their recent decision to rezone property at 4903 N. Grand River Avenue to E-1 drive in shop be amended to F commercial and J parking. A strip of land ten feet wide be zoned J parking along the entire south boundary and the west boundary for a distance of 20 feet from the south boundary of the property and that this strip of land be landscaped to form a visual screen from adjacent residential properties to the south and west. Further it is recommended that a six (6) foot high cyclone fence be constructed along the south lot line and west lot line for a distance of twenty feet from its southern end.

This petition to rezone 4903 N. Grand River to H light industrial was received by the Planning Board and recommended for denial on February 6, 1968.

At approximately the same time the property was purchased by someone other than the petitioner and as a result thereof the petition was referred back to the Board.

After reconsideration the Board advised Council on April 18, 1968 to rezone the property to E-1 drive in shop. Prior to Council's action on this recommendation the attorney for the new owner filed a new plea with the Council for reconsideration of the rezoning petition, requesting F commercial zoning so as to facilitate the operation of a custom upholstery shop. This letter was likewise referred to the Planning Board. The letter itself addresses itself very well to the problems of rezoning the area in question to F commercial even though the use itself, a custom upholstery shop, may not be a very intensive use and certainly compatible with the uses permitted in the E-1 drive in shop which the Board recommended on the previous occasion.

The fact remains however, that once the land is rezoned to F commercial the entire range of uses which are permitted in this district may take place and we are of the opinion that many of these uses would be inappropriate to the lands in question. This of course, is a sad commentary on our existing zoning ordinance and indicates the problems we have whenever a rezoning consideration is required. We would agree with the opinion expressed that our inadequate zoning ordinance should not act to penalize people and that there is some justification in the knowledge that the use proposed is compatible with the kinds of uses which the Board believes to be appro-

pritate to this area. It would also seem reasonable to assume that the uses could be fixed more desirably in the future at such time as a new zoning map is adopted in connection with proposed new code before the Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-24-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Lee Halstead to rezone property at 1100-1200 blocks Mel Avenue and 1300 block Northrup from A-1 family to C-2 family district be approved subject to: the existing lots being split, so as to provide for a minimum width of 70 feet at the building line for each developed lot.

Based on additional information submitted by the developer which indicates the type of development proposed, the Board does not believe the change will have any adverse affect on the surrounding area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-32-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommended to City Council that the petition by Ronald Wolfe to rezone property at 4500 S. Cedar St. from "A-1" Family Residential to "J" Parking be granted and further recommended that the West 10 ft. of Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 Everettdale Subdivision, City of Lansing, be rezoned from "F" Commercial to "J" Parking.

Screening to consist of one of the following:

1. A 6 ft. high chain-link fence with interwoven redwood slats.
2. A 3 ft. high chain-link fence with dense evergreen plantings of a mature height of 5 ft. to 5 ft. 6 in.
3. Any other type of screening that may be suggested by the property owner with the approval of the Planning Board.

The site is located within the area known as the Everett District, much of the development occurred prior to annexation with an unlimited amount of Commercial Zoning and Development taking place along Cedar Street.

In general Lansing's Commercial areas suffer from ribbon or strip commercial development along major streets. The concept of the Master Plan discourages further development of this nature, and encourages the development of integrated groups of stores. At the present time the City does not have monies available in which to carry out a program, to eliminate the existing strip development, and encourage re-use in the area.

Therefore the Board believes, it would be unreasonable to assume that the parcel would be redeveloped in accord with the existing zoning under existing land use conditions.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-33-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Allan Foy to rezone property at 1306-1314 Center Street and 417 Liberty St., from C-2 Family and J Parking to H Light Industrial be granted.

The Master Plan indicates this area as being well suited for industrial use. The criteria which governed the selection of this area included considerations of transportation, topography, utilities and etc. More recently the Cedar-Larch Corridor study conducted by the long range division of the Planning Department re-examined the Master Plan recommendations for this area and found that this area is well suited for industrial use.

Another aspect of this proposal which should be carefully considered is the effect which this use will have on the existing residential development in the area. The residential uses in the area consist of one, two and three family homes on relatively small lots. The structures are in poor condition and as such the Community Renewal Program suggests total clearance and redevelopment.

Based on the above analysis it appears that this application is in line with both existing and future public policies for this area.

Examination of the site plan submitted by the petitioner indicates that a building containing approximately 20,350 square feet with 32 off-street parking spaces. The proposed building is situated on the lot in a manner which is contrary to the yard requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Revisions to provide the necessary yards will have to be made.

The number of parking spaces is in line with the requirements of the proposed Zoning Ordinance.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-34-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Walter and Madeline Pettifor and Janette Cooper to rezone property at 515 Samantha St. from A-1 Family to B-1 Family be granted.

The site under consideration is located within an area along South Cedar Street that has retained its residential characteristics, and remained relatively stable. The contributing factor in this case would be the service road, which parallels South Cedar Street and provides a physical separation between the major arterial, and the developable land. Evidence of what can, and did occur regarding land use, without provisions of a service road exists along the West side of Cedar Street in this area much of the frontage is developed in a commercial nature, without adequate setbacks, off-street parking, controlled access, etc.

The existing building on the site is not really suitable for a single family residence. The change proposed for the site (religious education purposes) will be somewhat contrary to the established land use pattern, but the Board does not believe it will have any serious affect on the adjacent properties.

Excessive traffic will not be a problem, as this site will be used in conjunction with the church and parking directly to the South. Noise and activity should not present a problem, as the proposed use is for indoor classrooms.

The proposed change would encourage use of the property, which would remain vacant and neglected creating a blighting influence on the neighborhood and community.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-35-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Marilyn Benson to rezone property at 725-727-729-731 N. Larch St. and 730-732 N. Cedar St. from C-2 Family Residential to H Light Industrial District be denied.

The site under consideration is located in the area known as the Cedar-Larch Cor-

ridor. The Master Land Use Plan indicates this area for industrial expansion.

A subsequent report by the Long Range Division of the Planning Department, their suggestions and recommendations are outlined in the following analysis:

"The Master Plan designates this area for industrial Land Use. Industrial zoning and land uses are intermixed with one and two family dwelling units. The Cedar-Larch one-way pair is a moderate speed arterial allowing direct but congested access to other directional arterials and the interstate free-way system. The department has completed a preliminary study regarding the entire Cedar-Larch Corridor. The study analysis is the present land use relationships the future of land use needs concludes that this area would be more suitable for residential development and related commercial uses. Due to recent trends in traffic patterns affect on land use development, it is anticipated that Cedar Street will become a local street in the future. Studies are underway for major revision of the City's Master Plan which with a change in the Cedar-Larch traffic patterns this area would be designated as redevelopment with residential uses.

According to Urban Renewal Market Analysis for land utilization a significant amount of industrial land is not needed and sufficient land throughout Lansing is presently zoned for industrial.

The Community Renewal Program survey of housing conditions concludes that a major portion of the housing units is eligible for clearance, therefore, major redevelopment is required. This should not permit industrial uses to encroach on established residential areas because of the existing blighted conditions. This area is included in the Model Cities Neighborhood grant application for improving the general environment of existing minority group and blighted residential neighborhoods. Further industrial development in the area is undesirable since it would cause increasing decay and a down grading character to the residences adjacent to the petitioned area. It is not deemed necessary to rezone land with existing residential development to another classification with no intent as to intended use or for improving the nature of the area."

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-36-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by George Guerre to rezone property at the rear of 700-706 N. Washington Ave. from D-1 Professional to J-Parking be granted subject to screen-

ing being provided along a line 4 ft. North of the South property line, excepting the driveway opening and also along the West line of the J Parking District from a point 4 ft. North of the South property line to a point 22 feet North of the South property line.

Screening shall consist of a 3 ft. high brick wall of a style consistent with the exterior of the proposed office building.

The reason for this request is apparent upon examining the site plan submitted with this application: The petitioners wish to construct an office building with 3600 square feet of office area which would necessitate 12 parking spaces. It is not possible to provide 12 parking spaces and still maintain the necessary front yard setback along the parking area. In essence, this is a request to park in the front yard along Saginaw Street.

Due to the fact that Saginaw Street is one way Eastbound, the granting of this request will not cause any significant vision problems. In fact the only apparent problem posed by this request is one of aesthetics. The presence of parked cars along Saginaw Street will obviously detract from overall appearance of the area, especially in view of the excellent screen being constructed along Saginaw Street by the Community College. If a similar treatment could be executed of the subject property, the Board would have no objection to the granting of this rezoning. With this thought in mind the Staff made contact with the petitioner and suggested that a similar wall which would effectively screen the parking area be provided on the subject property. The petitioner was not in agreement with this idea and further felt that shrubbery and plantings would be adequate. To grant this request without requiring substantial assurance that the aesthetic values of the area will not be harmed will establish a dangerous precedent which may trigger further requests to encroach upon the yard areas of office districts in the Central City.

The petitioner's only stated objection to our suggested masonry wall was that it would be too expensive. However, when the expense is balanced against the less of additional income caused by building a smaller office building, the additional expense may be more justified.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-37-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Russell M. Fink, acting for Mrs. Ruth Richard, to rezone property at 2421 N. Grand River Avenue from "A" one family to "D" apartment district be granted and further

recommends that the parcel to the Northwest and adjacent to the subject property described as:

Com. at pt. on S'ly line N. Grand River Ave. 84.07 ft. NW'ly from N.E. corner Lot 21, thence NW'ly along N. Grand River Ave. 91.95 ft. S. 38.3 ft. W. 87.15 ft. S. 19.45 ft. W. 58.45 ft. S. 61.5 ft. E. 148.5 ft., N. 6.5 ft., E. 139.6 ft. to beg. exc. land used for street purposes; TOWNSEND'S SUBD. on Sections 4, 5, 8 and 9

be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "D" apartment district.

Screening consisting of a six foot high chain-link fence with interwoven redwood slats, or other type of screening as may be suggested by the developer and approved by the Planning Board be provided along the East line of the property requested for a change in zoning.

The present configuration of the zoning districts in this area coupled with the property ownership characteristics, support the petitioners contention that logical development of this area demands assemblage of the land. However, examination of the area further reveals that even if this request is granted, an isolated parcel will be left over and will no doubt be the subject of zoning petitions in the future.

Another problem which presents itself concerns the single family residences located immediately East of the property. If this request is granted, it will be possible to construct a ninety foot high structure within thirty-five feet of the rear property line of these single family lots. The result would be a severe loss of rear yard privacy.

The petitioner explicitly claims that this parcel will be left open but will be used to increase the number of units and also to provide an additional outlet to N. Grand River Avenue. Unfortunately, there is no method of guaranteeing that the petitioners intent will become a reality. On the other hand, if the property is developed as a separate entity, it is very likely that the result would be considerably more detrimental to the adjacent properties.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Fink—1.

Z-38-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo Farhat, attorney acting for S. Clay to rezone property in the 4600 block of Dunkel Drive from A-1 Family to E-2 Drive in District be denied.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern, which is predominately single-family residential.

The change would adversely affect property values in the immediate vicinity, and may therefore deter their improvement or development in accord with these existing regulations.

Zoning changes such as these are notorious for fostering uncontrolled development in areas that are relatively stable, encouraging ribbon or strip commercial development along major streets, increasing traffic congestion, and more important a residential collector.

The Board believes that the existing and proposed service stations in this area are adequate to serve the existing and potential population.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-39-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Leo Farhat, attorney, acting for Edward Marion, to rezone from A-1 Family Residential to D-1 Professional and E-2 Drive in District be denied as filed, and that:

Lots 37, 38, 39 Green Acres Subdivision be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "E-2" Drive in.

Lot 40, 41, and 42 Green Acres Subdivision be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "D-M" Multiple.

The Board believes that the recommendation for "D-M:1" Multiple on the Western 3 Lots will be in keeping with the Forest View Master Plan and will establish a precedent for future development along Jolly Road, which will discourage the possibility of strip commercial development.

The site under consideration is located at the intersection of two major arterials, both of which are oriented to the interstate freeway system I-496. Dunkel Drive is proposed to be extended South to connect with Miller Road creating a focal point at the intersection of Dunkel Drive and Jolly Road for the diversion of traffic to other areas of the City.

It is further pointed out that the existing and proposed residential development, in the area will have ease of access to the site, and will contribute to its support.

In summary the Board believe the service station site is strategically located in relation to thru traffic, and traffic originating in the area.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is residential, but would be physically separated on three sides by public streets.

The Board does not believe that the development of the immediate corner of the subject property for a service station will adversely affect any surrounding property or the general welfare, and that the typical service station with its large set-back will leave clear vision for traffic at this major intersection. Due to proposed and potential development of the immediate area and the exposure to two major arterials, the Committee believes that the portion proposed for the service station lends itself to the type of use, but there are no substantial reasons why the balance of the property proposed for professional office use cannot be developed in a residential nature. This property has ease of access to both an interior residential street, and a major arterial. With proper development plans the adverse affects on the existing potential development could be reduced to a minimum.

Office development is generally considered more desirable, located within an integrated shopping center or within those areas designated for office use. Indiscriminate zoning detracts from these areas, and could threaten the stability of the overall plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-41-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Charles Richey to rezone a parcel at the N.E. Corner Paulson St. and N. East St. described as:

E. 35 ft. Lots 1 and 2, East Street Subd.

S. 1/2 of W. 130 ft. exc. W. 17 ft. Lot 1, East Street Subd. City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A" one family to F Commercial District be not granted for lack of space.

Despite the fact that this area of North East St. is made up of mixed commercial uses some of which extend into the residential streets, the original site has been diminished in area by approximately 50%—from 23306 sq. ft. to 10,234 sq. ft.—as a result of an error in the legal description presented on the petition. This has resulted in an irregular shaped lot of marginal utility.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-42-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Max Curtis to rezone property at 3003 E. Michigan Ave. from A-1 Family and J-Parking to F-Commercial be denied as filed and that the property be zoned as follows: (F Commercial)

Lots 54 through 78 of Alamo Heights Subdivision and also property described as beginning at the Northeast corner of Lot 78, thence East 9.45 feet, thence south to a point which is 9.45 feet East of the Northwest corner of Lot 54; thence East 9.45 feet; thence South 320 feet; thence East 140 feet; thence South 16 feet; thence West 298.9 feet; thence North 16 feet; thence East 140 feet; thence North to the point of beginning. Excepting the East 5 feet; the West 5 feet of the South 75 feet and the South 5 feet of the East 125 feet, and the balance of the property be zoned "J" Parking with landscaping of low evergreen plantings.

This request is prompted by recent acquisition of the petitioner's used car lot as it was in the path of the US-27 Freeway. This action necessitated acquisition of some additional property to relocate the used car facilities.

The petitioner plans on constructing additions to the existing buildings to bring his facilities more in time with his needs.

Specifically, the petitioner proposed a large addition to the main structure to be used for servicing automobiles; a 2200 square foot addition to the existing body shop, a slight addition to the front of the main structure for showroom expansion and a used car sales office. Total floor areas upon completion of the expansion program will be as follows:

Showroom, office areas, and	
Service Shop	35,340 square feet
Body Shop	6,600 square feet
Total	42,140 square feet

In addition thirty-one off-street parking spaces have been provided for customer parking. The parking ratio is slightly inadequate in terms of the standards of the proposed new zoning ordinance, however, sufficient land area appears to be available should the need for additional parking arise.

Examination of the existing zoning districts map show that the area occupied by the body shop is presently zoned "H" Light Industrial. This classification is not necessary as the body shop is an accessory use to the new car sales and may occur therefore in the "F" District. Therefore we would recommend that area presently zoned "H" Light be included in this petition and also be rezoned to "F" Commercial.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-43-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Thomas G. Sinas, attorney, acting for S.D., B., and W., Building Firm to rezone property at 527 N. Capitol Avenue from D-M Multiple to D-1 Professional be granted.

The site under consideration is within the area designated for offices and services, and is so indicated on the Central City Development Plan. The site appears large enough, and capable of handling the required off-street parking with the proposed change in use. Location of offices within those areas designated for office use should be encouraged, it will stimulate development in accordance with the plan and discourage the scatterization and mixed land use throughout the Central City Area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-44-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Phillip Carey to rezone property at 5321 S. Pennsylvania Ave. from "J" parking to "F" Commercial be denied.

The site is located in an area where much of the development occurred prior to annexation. Zoning controls were not strictly applied in the sense that it appears very little consideration was given to the adjacent residential properties, and the impact strip zoning would have on planned integrated shopping centers, and also the adverse affects strip zoning has on the traffic carrying capacity of streets on which it fronts.

The requested change would not be contrary to the established land use pattern, but it would permit additional development of the property which could deprive existing, and proposed development of adequate off-street parking and open space.

The applicant may profess that adequate, or more than adequate off-street parking is available for the existing use, and that the "J" Parking District prohibits full development of the land. The Board believes that though this may be true at the present time, past experience has indicated that uses do change, and off-

street parking demands can increase. It is further pointed out that, the initial change of zoning on this property took into consideration a reasonable ratio of off-street parking to commercial area.

Access to this site is proposed from Shirley Street, which is developed in single family homes East of the strip commercial. The adverse influences of increased traffic and activity could affect this area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-221-65

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the landscape plans for Vincent Court Community Unit Plan be approved subject to the following amendments:

- a. Dense evergreen plantings around all parking areas with the exception of egress points and pedestrian access points opposite townhouse entrances.
- b. Artificial lighting of all parking areas at 2/10 lumens either on lamp posts or directed into parking lots suspended from the housing units themselves.
- c. Privacy courts, to the satisfaction of the Planning Department.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported on a meeting to be held soon on the finalized plan for Urban Renewal Project No. 2 with the consulting firm of Villican Leman.

Also one meeting has occurred on Urban Renewal Project No. 3 with the consultants for this project.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that there are currently two positions vacant in the Community Renewal Program. An extension of the Program has been approved to December 21, 1968.

SS-1-67 Forest View Community

Mr. Guernsey reported that two meetings have been set regarding the Forest View Community. The Board will receive notification and agenda on these meetings.

SS-17-68 HUD Award for Design Excellence

Motion by Duncan seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board sponsor Lansing Community College as an entrant in the HUD award competition. The Board to request concurrence from Lansing Community College, The Warren-Holmes Company who are the campus architects, and from Johnson, Johnson, and Roy the Campus site planners.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Shopping Center Study Report No. 4

Mr. Guernsey reported that the Shopping Center Study Report No. 4 has been forwarded to the Board for their perusal.

Sign Ordinance

City Council has strongly urged the preparation of a sign ordinance for Lansing to be forwarded to them as soon as possible.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Fink that the Planning Department staff be instructed to proceed with the sign ordinance study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Reynolds suggested that the staff investigate signs in Urban Renewal projects.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Z-61-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Heino that the Planning Board initiate a petition to rezone property at 508 S. Walnut Street from D Apartment District to "J" Parking District for the good of the community. There is an urgent need for parking for the school due to the congestion in the area.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Black requested permission to be excused from any Planning Board meetings from this date through June 10, 1968, since he will be out of town.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that Mr. Black request be approved by the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 18, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:45 P.M. by
Vice-Chairman Kenneth Black.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Siebert, Reynolds, Gaus,
Heino—5.

Absent: Fink, Duncan, Bretz—3.

HEARINGS

P-4-68P

Mr. Gregory Main of the Planning Department spoke on behalf of Glendale Manor, explaining the location and size of the Preliminary Plat.

Mr. George Haines of 233 W. Northrup Street questioned the amount of storm sewers and if the homes would be single family homes.

Rudolph Soderberg of 500 Doris Street questioned the valuation of these homes.

Mr. Main assured Mr. Haines the Public Service Department would be contacted for assurance of the location of the storm sewers. The homes would all be single family homes however the valuation of these homes is not known as the plans for development were not available as yet.

Mr. Haines asked how soon would plans for development be ready.

Mr. Main stated at least two or three months.

Mrs. Bretz arrived at 7:50 P.M.

Mr. Main stated the lengths of the lots being 150 ft. and also presented the possible street pattern.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

Mrs. Bretz took the chair at 8:05 P.M.

Civil Defense

Mr. William Bechtel, Planner, gave a progress report of the work being coordinated with the Staff of Tri-County which is making a study, and plan, for the remainder of the region.

Mr. Holcomb spoke on the necessity of shelters within a radius of every $\frac{3}{4}$ mile and the location of present shelters.

Mrs. Bretz introduced new Board member Mr. Bruce Blackall.

RECESS.

Motion by Gaus, supported by Reynolds to approve minutes of March 19, 1968 and April 2, 1968.

Motion passed by unanimous vote.

SS-14-67

South Logan Street Zoning Policy Plan.

Motion by Black, supported by Heino to table this matter until July 2, 1968 meeting.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Gaus; Reynolds; Heino; Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-15-68

Motion by Black, supported by Reynolds to approve in principle an amendment to the Zoning Code providing for regulations governing the provisions of the housing for the elderly.

This amendment would take the following form and a brief explanatory statement at the beginning will help explain our basis for recommending a code amendment:

"It would appear desirable to amend the present code to allow for the differences

in elderly housing. For instance, under the present code, elderly housing is permitted subject to the same density standards (that is dwelling units per acre) as conventional apartments. In fact, therefore, housing for the elderly is at a disadvantage because the density in terms of persons per acre is more restrictive. Such housing often will have one person to a dwelling unit and therefore could be only $\frac{1}{4}$ as densely populated as a conventional apartment.

In view of this it would seem equitable if the code were amended to correct this disparity. I have reviewed the Vilcan Leman code in this respect and while the code itself does not reflect the difference in persons per acre, nevertheless using the technique and standards of this code would permit a greater density than the existing code now permits. The technique of permitting the use subject to special conditions would also make it possible to achieve site plan control which is highly desirable.

We recommend therefore that the "D-M" and "D" districts be amended to include a section on "Uses Subject to Special Conditions" using the standards set out in the proposed Vilcan Leman Code. It should be noted that no change is recommended for the "D-M:1" districts, because it is our opinion that the code in this respect is satisfactorily designed to permit cottage type elderly housing which is in keeping with the intent of the "D-M:1" district.

The effect of the above recommendation would take the following form:

Amend Section 36-23 part (8) which shall read as follows:

(8) Uses Subject to Special Conditions

- (a) Elderly housing subject to special conditions: Housing specifically designed to meet the special needs of elderly citizens shall be permitted, subject to the conditions hereinafter imposed for this use and subject further to the review and approval of a site plan by the Planning Department.

A. All housing for the elderly shall be provided as a planned development consisting of at least one (1) acre, and such buildings shall not exceed the height limitations of the D-M districts. Such housing may also provide for the following:

1. Cottage type dwellings and/or apartment type dwelling units.
2. Common services containing but not limited to central dining rooms, recreational rooms, central lounge, and workshops.

B. All dwellings shall consist of at least three hundred and fifty (350) square feet per unit (not including kitchen and sanitary facilities).

C. Total coverage of all buildings (including dwelling units and related service buildings) shall not exceed fifty (50) percent of the total site exclusive of any dedicated public right-of-way.

D. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each two dwelling units and one for each employee. Should units revert to general occupancy; then two (2) spaces per unit shall be provided.

E. In the D-M multiple family district the total number of rooms of eighty (80) square feet or more (not including kitchens and sanitary facilities) shall not be more than the area of the parcel in square feet, divided by nine hundred (900) in the D-M district for the purpose of computing the permitted number of dwelling units per acre the following room assignments shall control:

Efficiency	1-room
One Bedroom	2-room
Two Bedroom	3-room
16-1 bedrooms	32-rooms
16 efficiencies	16-rooms

F. Screening and/or fencing as may be required by the Planning Board.

Amend the D Apartment District to Provide:

The same as above except that the height would be changed to the height permitted in the D apartment district (90 feet) and provide for greater density by changing E above to read "divided by four hundred and fifty (450) rather than nine hundred (900).

Example—Permits 97 room/acre.

33 1 bedroom	66 rooms
/31 efficiencies	31 rooms
64 unit 1 acre	97 rooms

The Board also requested authorization to hold public hearing on the above proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Gaus, Bretz, Reynolds, Heino, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

SS-22-68

Motion by Black, supported by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council an amendment to the Zoning Code providing for modifications to the setback provisions for existing developed areas be approved in principle.

This amendment would take the following form and a brief explanatory statement at the beginning will help explain our basis for recommending a code amendment.

The following is a proposal for amending the present Zoning Code to provide regulations and requirements for fences and walls. At present the Code is silent in these matters and as a consequence thereof we have had to resort to conditional zoning which is of questionable legal status. Council and the public however believe screening requirements are desirable and do protect private property rights. Such regulations are proposed in the Vilcan Leman proposed code, however since the enactment of this code is some time in the future, it is not prudent to wait for its enactment.

Therefore we recommend that the existing code be amended. In particular we suggest that Section 36-54 of the code, namely-Exceptions to height and area regulations be amended to read "Exceptions to height and area regulations and provisions for fences and walls." A new subsection (3) would provide as follows:

3. 1. Walls

There shall be provided and maintained an obscuring wall, planting screen, earth berm or other visual barrier as may be determined by the Planning Board when the following zone district relationships exist. Planting materials shall be subject to the specifications of the Department of Parks and Recreation and shall be maintained to their satisfaction. Said visual and physical screens shall be provided by the owners of the least restrictive zone district.

A. Use District Regulationship

J, D, D-1, E, E-1, E-2, and F when contiguous to A, B, C-2, D-M:1, or D-M districts.

Requirements: Minimum height of the following screens shall not be less than five feet (5), measured at the grade of the least restrictive district to top of screen:

- (I) A masonry wall.
 - (II) A chain link fence with either interwoven slats or dense evergreen trees on five (5) foot centers.
 - (III) A Berm with dense evergreen trees planted thereon, on five (5) foot centers, combined heights shall not be less than the required minimum height.
- B. G., G-2, H and I districts when contiguous to A, B, C-2, D-M:1, D-M, D and D-1 districts.

Requirements: Same requirements as above except that the minimum height of said walls, fence and/or plantings a shall not be less than eight (8) feet.

- C. G. G-2, H and I districts when contiguous to E, E-1, E-2, and F districts. Requirements: Same requirements as above except that the minimum height

of said walls, fence and/or plantings shall not be less than three (3) feet.

- D. Around the perimeter of all parking areas in D-M, D-M:1, D and D-1 districts except for openings as approved by the Planning Department.

Requirements: Minimum height of the following screens shall not be less than three and one half (3½) feet measured at the grade of parking surface to top of screen:

- (I) A berm together with dense evergreen plantings.
- (II) Dense evergreen planting of mature height sufficient to fulfill the minimum height requirement.

2. Fences (Residential)

36-20.13 Fences (Residential): Fences are permitted, or required subject to the following:

- (1) Side and rear fences: Fences constructed within a side or rear yard shall not be higher than six (6) feet except as provided herein:
- (2) Planting, fences and walls in front yard: No fence, wall or hedge shall rise over two feet in height on any required front yard. No fence, wall or hedge planting shall interfere with visibility from a driveway. The enforcing officer is hereby empowered to cause all such obstruction to be removed in the interest of the public safety.
- (3) Fences on recorded lots having a lot area in excess of two (2) acre and a frontage of at least two hundred (200) feet, and acreage or parcels not included within the boundaries of a recorded plat, in all residential districts are excluded from these regulations.
- (4) Fences on lots of record shall not contain barbed wire, electric current or charge of electricity.
- (5) Fences which enclose public or institutional parks, playgrounds, or public landscaped areas, situated within an area developed with recorded lots shall not exceed eight (8) feet in height, measured from the surface of the ground, and shall not obstruct vision to extent greater than twenty-five (25) percent of their total area.
- (6) All fences shall comply with the requirements of the Building Code as it applies to fence installation and materials.

The Board also requested authorization to hold a public hearing on the above proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Black, Heino, Gaus, Siebert, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

S-25-68

Motion by Black, supported by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the amendment to the Zoning Code providing for modifications to the setback provisions for existing developed areas be approved in principle:

Two aspects of the present zoning code which act as a catalyst for requests to amend the code or forms the basis of petitions to the Board of Zoning Appeals is concerned with setbacks in the established districts and advertising signs.

Particularly with respect to the question of setbacks we believe the code sets up an undesirable land use regulation and may act to seriously penalize property. Considerable experience with this section reveals that it is overly restrictive and not in the best interest of good land use practices. The Building Department will substantiate this and they would like to see the code amended.

In existing single family districts which are so zoned and will remain so, the prevalent consensus is that left over parcels should only be required to set back as far as the average of the properties on either side of the vacant parcel or the nearest developed lot.

In those areas which are experiencing redevelopment and which are zoned to encourage another use it does not appear rational to require that a lot be developed reflecting the set back of adjacent properties, which themselves are to be redeveloped in the future. The setback for that particular use district should be the required setback. This may be less or more than the existing average block setback however, this should be immaterial in view of the fact that the area is in transition to the zoned or future planned use. The setbacks for the future land use is the important consideration. We would therefore recommend that the section of the zoning ordinance pertaining to a setback based upon 40% of the existing block setback be deleted from all sections in which it appears. The immediate effect of this would be to establish the setback as that required by the zoning district within which the use is permitted.

The exception to the above we suggest should be the single family districts and in this regard we would recommend that in place of the above deletion, there be added the provision that the setback be established by the average of the abutting parcels in the event they are undeveloped, the setback would be that required by the single family district.

36-44 (4) Delete fourth paragraph commencing: Provided, however, where lots comprising forty per-cent . . . to end of paragraph-and substitute with;

Provided, however, where prior development has taken place the front yard

requirement for vacant lots or existing homes to which additions are planned, need not be greater than the average setback of the dwelling units nearest either side of the vacant lot or residence to which additions are planned, except that under no circumstances need a greater setback be provided than the minimum required by this section."

36-45 (4) Delete part of the first paragraph (p. 636) commencing at the 4th line "Provided however where lots comprising (40) percent . . . to the end of paragraph and substitute;

"Provided, however, where prior development has taken place the front yard requirement for vacant lots or existing homes to which additions are planned, need not exceed the average set-back of the dwelling units nearest either side of the vacant lot or residences to which additions are planned, except that under no circumstances need a greater setback be provided than the minimum required by this section."

36-46 (4) Delete 2nd paragraph commencing "Where lots comprising forty (40) percent . . ." to end of paragraph.

36-47 (4) Delete 2nd paragraph commencing "Where lots comprising forty (40) percent . . ." to end of paragraph.

36-47.1 (4) Delete 3rd paragraph commencing "Where lots comprising (40) percent . . ." to end of paragraph.

The Board also requested authorization to hold public hearing on the above proposed amendment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Black, Gaus, Siebert, Reynolds, Heino—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-9-68

Mr. Gregory Main presented the vacation of the southerly 265 feet of the north-south alley in the block bounded by Ionia, Washington, Shiawassee and Capitol.

Motion by Gaus, Supported by Black that the request to vacate the southerly 265 ft. of the north-south alley in the block bounded by Ionia, N. Capitol, Shiawassee, within Urban Renewal Project No. 1 be approved, as it conforms to the land use plan for Urban Renewal No. 1.

The alley proposed for vacation is in accord with the approved plan for the redevelopment within Urban Renewal Project No. 1 and will be replaced by an "L" shaped alley extending from N. Capitol to Ionia.

All City Departments and public utilities concerned have been contacted and approve this vacation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Heino, Reynolds, Siebert, Gaus—6.

Nays: None.

SS-11-65

Market Study. Motion by Reynolds, supported by Black to recommend to the City Council that:

WHEREAS, Michigan State University, through its agriculture extension services has agreed to assist the City of Lansing in the preparation of a Market Study and analysis concerning the future of Lansing's Municipal Market, and

WHEREAS, this analysis involves the conducting of surveys, interviews, and other research processes, which will require the expenditure of a limited amount of funds,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Lansing Planning Board be authorized to expend up to \$500.00 for this work, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the necessary funds are to be obtained from monies budgeted from the Planning Board's Planning Consultant Fee Account.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Gaus, Bretz, Reynolds, Heino, Siebert—6.

Nays: None.

Mapped Improvements Ordinance

Mr. Black reported that the text for the Mapped Improvement Ordinance was

received from the Board's Ordinance Committee to examine.

Ottawa Street Bridge

Mr. James Spackman of the Planning Department stated the study was in progress for three or four possible alignments and as of yet no final report was available.

Mr. Black questioned Mr. Guernsey as to the meeting of the Tri-County on June 20, 1968.

Mr. Guernsey stated the meeting was mainly for discussing the Basic development issues that face the Tri-County Region.

Work Program

Mr. Guernsey stated he and Mr. Brown were working on a work program and would submit it at a later date.

Personnel

Mr. Guernsey announced the resignation of Bruce Bedell in the Graphics Department.

Forest View Community Status Report

Mr. Bechtel presented a printed progress report.

New Business

Mr. Black stated the Board was sorry to see Mr. Siebert leave. He worked very diligently with the Zoning Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 9:46 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, June 4, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:35 p.m. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and
Reynolds—5.

Absent: Black, Duncan and Siebert—3.

HEARINGS

PS-11-68

Mr. James A. Church of the Planning Department Staff, discussed the request for a land use permit for the removal of sand and other materials as provided for by Section 36-52 of the Code of the City of Lansing. He stated that in December of 1966 the City of Lansing initiated a request to the Department of Housing and Urban Development for an Open Space Land Program Grant, for a Red Cedar Basin Park. In February, 1968, Lansing was awarded a \$231,708 grant to help purchase 90 acres of the Red Cedar Basin for park development. The area of consideration in this request is located within the flood plain of the Red Cedar River between E. Mt. Hope on the south and the C & O Railroad right of way on the north. The extension of Aurelius Road from Mt. Hope to I-496 is proposed along a section of the westerly line of the southerly 60 acre parcel. The area is presently undeveloped and in its natural state. The total area consists of approximately 90 acres, 60 acres located north of Aurelius and south of the Grand Trunk Railroad and south and east of the Red Cedar River, the second parcel of 30 acres is located between the Grand Trunk Railroad right of way and the C & O railroad right of way and between the Red Cedar River and the easterly boundary of the City.

Basil Brown, Attorney, appearing for the petitioner, Mr. Wright, Office address, 1101 First National Building, Detroit, 48226. "The petitioner is aware of your ordinance 36-52 and fully agrees with the terms thereof and extends his willingness to comply, in that he will not leave the land in such condition as to permit a collection of stagnant water, nor will he change the surface so as to leave it in an unstable condition, or a condition which is unsuited to

the growing of turf or any other lawful use in that area. The request is that my client Mr. Wright, who either owns or leases these two parcels comprising a total of 90 acres, be permitted to remove the existing topsoil from that area and then remove the sand and gravel which is lying beneath that topsoil at various depths, for commercial purposes. We would also be quite willing to comply with such reasonable terms and conditions to guarantee our compliance as the Planning Board or the Council should require. After removing the topsoil, his plans are to excavate the commercial sand and gravel from beneath the surface. He intends not to cause any excavation nearer than 150 feet to his property lines on the four sides of each parcel, and he intends to maintain suitable dikes between his excavations and the Red Cedar River where that occurs so as to not permit flooding from that river or from the territory adjacent to that river into such excavated sites. He also intends at the top of the diking structure to erect a suitable fence to prevent trespassers from entering the property and perhaps getting involved in the excavating work as it is progressing. These are the conditions that we think would guarantee to the City and to the Planning Board, initially, that we intend to leave the property substantially the same as it is at the present time. After the sand and gravel found there is removed, it is the intention of the owner and lessor, Mr. Wright, to refill this property with dirt that is brought in from some other location, perhaps with masonry, and other items, other materials collected, which we believe will provide a solid foundation for any use of the land which is now permitted or which might be permitted in the future. The excavation, the removal of the topsoil will take some period of time; then the removal of the sand and gravel will take some period of time, and the fill will be some few weeks, or perhaps even a few months behind the actual removal of the sand and gravel. During all of this time, until the property is restored to its present level, the dikes and the fences will be maintained and as I said initially, at least 150 feet from the lot lines on all sides. The application by Mr. Wright did not contain a proposed grade site as the ordinance requires, because it is his desire and intention to leave the grade site, when finishes removing and backfilling, exactly as it is now. There will be no change in

the grade site. If there are any questions I will be very happy to try to answer them. Mr. Wright is aware, obviously, of the City's intentions to acquire this property and to build an extension of Aurelius Road and to turn this eventually into a Municipal Park. We believe that the proposed use of this property by Mr. Wright would be completed well before the City is financially and planning-wise able to either extend Aurelius Road or to acquire the entire site for a city park. We believe that the excavation of the sand and gravel that is there and the backfill to its existing levels or better, would provide the land in as good or better condition than it is now for the park purposes."

Mrs. Bretz. "Is there anyone in the audience who would like to speak pertaining to this matter?"

C. R. Stebbins, 1710 Moores River Drive, Chairman of the River Improvement Committee. "We hope that any changes that are made, you will take into consideration the Red Cedar River. As you know we have very few lakes around here, no mountains, so the river should be an asset. Anything that is done we hope you will seriously consider the general use especially for park purposes later on."

Alec Gimmell, 2817 E. Mt. Hope, "I was in hopes that we would have a city park out there. It is purely residential except for three business places in that neighborhood and I'd like to see it stay that way. If we have a gravel pit we are bound to have a pile of trucks, dirt, dust, noise, which we don't have now. In taking it out and filling it back in, we will have it in reverse, we'll have a dump there."

Charles G. Hayden, Director of Parks and Recreation, City of Lansing. "I think you are all aware that these parcels of property lying in this flood basin have been desired by the City of Lansing for many, many years. The property has been held in an estate and the City has been unable to buy this property for many, many years. Urbanization has thrust itself upon us today however, with an accent that has never been felt before. This particular area, we feel, is important to the City of Lansing, to the inhabitants around it. We have Potter Park on one side, we have Arboretum on the other, and here lies a natural area, nothing like it within the immediate area adjacent to the City of Lansing, but this area. In just interest of conservancy we feel this area is important to the City, important to the people. These areas are fast diminishing, there are not too many of them left. We do have the deed for the borrow pit area. It has been given us now by the State in exchange for some property that we exchanged with the new construction of I-496. I feel that this land is open space that's going to be needed over the generations yet to come. With East Lansing and the complex of Michigan State University to the east, with the urbanization to the north and the anticipated population growth

to the south, this is not too large a park complex, this is vital to areas like Lansing today, and more so in the 30, 50, 100 and 200 years from now. This area is natural, a wilderness. We don't propose to develop this as a park, with baseball diamonds and things of this sort. We feel that as flood plain it is important. It is important to the community as a water resource, it is important to us in the interest of education. The City of Lansing felt strongly enough about this that some many months ago we made application to Housing and Urban Development. We have been notified by them that they are interested; they have reviewed all our application, we are in the process of appraising this parcel. I would anticipate a fair appraisal being made of this property. I would like the City of Lansing to have an opportunity of taking that appraisal price, sitting down with the owners of the parcel and exercising every right that the City finds itself endowed with, to acquire this land. I think this is vitally important to us. I'm sure that the City Council, Planning Department, and I know that the Park Board, felt that it was important to us or else we would never have made application to the Federal authorities. An excavation of this area, to my way of thinking, and a re-filling, of this area would be desimation and wanton destruction. I certainly feel that it's an area that is important to the City today."

Mrs. Bretz. "Thank you—Does anyone have any questions? Anyone on the Board?"

Basil Brown. "The owner of this property has not been able to make any economically advantageous use of this land but all this time assessed and taxes have been paid. I am suggesting also that the application with HUD, for money to acquire this property may or may not be forthcoming, and if it is, it will not be forthcoming for another year or 2 or 3 or 4. Again, during which period of time, the owner and lessee of this property must maintain it to some degree and pay taxes with no economic advantage to himself. Now it may be nice, Madame Chairman and members of the Board, to have a wild fowl refuge where ducks and wild life may find habitat in a natural surrounding. I wonder, however, if those who advocate against the reasonable use of this land, as I submit our request is, would feel that their property ought to be the habitat of our natural resources, our ducks and rabbits and pheasants, rather than someone else. Again, in terms of removal of trees, it is not Mr. Wright's desire to remove trees unnecessarily, a good many of them will be removed. I remind you that those within at least 150 feet of the boundaries will not be, and certainly those immediately adjacent to the Red Cedar and its meandering tributaries, will not be removed because he will maintain a dike between the removal areas and those areas. And I submit to you that he might very well be able to remove all those trees anyway without excavating the property, since he is the owner and lessee of the property. What

we are asking is that in the interim between the time that the City of Lansing is desirous of acquiring this property and making it into a public park for public use, that the owner be permitted to make economic use of the land which will not seriously detract from the use which the City has in mind or which anyone else may have in mind, and certainly will not effect the adjacent owners along the boundaries of these properties or the riparian owners of the Red Cedar River. He proposes to maintain the levels of the grade as they are now and not make a dump of the property, as someone suggested, but to grade it and backfill it with dirt and masonry and nothing else, certainly no refuse or no garbage as was perhaps unintentionally suggested. So I am asking, Madame Chairman, members of the Board, that we be permitted to make this reasonable use during the period of time that it will take, I'm sure, for the City to make up its mind, for the Federal Government to make up its mind, and for this to be finally dedicated as a public park. We emphasize again, our willingness to comply with all reasonable terms and conditions or guarantees that this Board or the City Council requires."

Charles G. Hayden. "I don't want to belabor this point, but the appraisal is in progress. Any alteration in the use of this land is going to make a change in the market value of this land. Again I say that if the City felt that it was important a few months ago when the application was made, the City still feels, in my opinion, or should, that it is still important. I have no reason to think, because the appraisal is due within the month, that this will drag on for a long period as indicated by Mr. Brown because the City has its money, we are ready, the Federal Government has a portion of the money for us. This much they have told us and I think that it could be consummated rather quickly."

Mr. Edwin Brown. "Madame Chairman, we have a letter from the League of Women Voters regarding this matter."

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Edwin Brown. "Madame Chairman, I would also like to present to this Board a verbal request of the Woldumar Associates to have testimony which they are now preparing be permitted on the record at a later time."

Mrs. Bretz. "They may present it."

This information is now on file in the Planning Department.

Al Raytell. "Is this the property where they are applying for removal of sand and gravel, Special Use Permit?" Is this land to be donated to the City of Lansing after they have their work completed "

Mr. Raytell was informed that there will be no restrictions.

Mr. Raytell. "We worked with the City of Lansing 2 or 3 years ago on something similar to this and through the negotiations it was necessary for us to donate the land to the City of Lansing for future park use."

Mr. Edwin Brown. "The hearing tonight addresses itself to the application of a permit. Certainly if there is any permit granted, there will be areas of give and take on both sides, what the terms of the final agreement, no one could say."

Mr. Raytell. "It seems two or three years ago a new ordinance was passed in the City of Lansing that there shall be no future sand and gravel permits inside the City Limits of Lansing proper."

Mr. Edwin Brown. "It would be "No removal of minerals except by Special Permit", this has been on the books for about a year."

Mr. Raytell. "Except by Special Permit"?

Mr. Edwin Brown. "That's right, and this man has applied for a Special Permit."

Basil Brown, requested that a copy of the letter from the League of Women Voters and a copy of the testimony be made available to him.

Mr. Edwin Brown. "I think it should also be said for the record, that dating as far back as the 1921 Master Plan, for Lansing, this land has been earmarked for recreational, to be preserved for recreational purposes."

Bill Rowden, Assistant Director, Tri-County Planning Commission. "We reviewed this proposal at the staff request. We have not taken the opportunity to explore it thoroughly. We have, however, reviewed the site again, on foot. We have in the past, our Commission has, supported the City's application for open space funds to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It would be our staff conclusion at this point that this area should be retained in its natural state if it is to be developed as proposed, as a natural area and a logical extension of Arboretum as well as Potter Park. In examining the region as a whole and coming up with our 1975-1990 Regional Land Use Plan, we have evidenced on the Plan that this area should of course be retained for recreation if at all possible. This area is of course, in the flood plain area. More important is the natural geology of the area and retention for a natural park. It is the only close in area that we have in the core of the Metropolitan Region that is suitable for this purpose, in our examination. We would be willing to further study this with your staff at a later time."

Matter referred to Building and Properties.

Z-51-68

Conway Longson, Attorney representing petitioners, in behalf of petition to rezone property at 2620 and 2634 N. Grand River Avenue from "F" Commercial and "J" Parking to E-2 Drive-In Shop District, stated a service station is proposed for this site. Mr. Longson discussed the background of the Hi-Fi Gasoline Stations incorporated, who are the petitioners.

Mr. A. R. McAllister, 4332 Harbrough Road, Columbus, Ohio explained the company in question and their marketing program. Discussed the background of the Oil industry. This company buys or leases properties that are desirable commercial properties, serving high traffic flow areas, and operate on a large volume basis. Mr. McAllister submitted colored rendering of the facility that is proposed for this property. He discussed the layout and construction of the proposed service station. No service proposed other than the retail sales of products.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 8:20 p.m.

John Burton, Walter Neller Company, 122 S. Grand Avenue, realtor, stated that he and Mr. Petroff made a study of the area, and came to the conclusion that this proposal is one of the best uses for the property.

John Petroff, Petroff Realty, felt that the design of the proposed building would enhance any neighborhood in the City of Lansing.

Mr. David Duncan questioned the feasibility of another service station in the area.

Discussion followed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-55-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 932 Paulson and 932 Chilson Street from A-1 Residential to I Heavy Industrial District.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-56-68

Mr. Charles Brooks, petitioner, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3200 block of Amherst Street from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple Dwelling District.

William Gill, 3624 Wilson Avenue, questioned the exact location of the proposal,

what type of multiple dwelling is proposed, and the identity of the developer of the project. Mr. Fountain of the Planning staff stated the developer is Charles Brooks, who proposed multiple family on the site. Mr. Gill stated that the property owners in the area of the proposal would like to be kept informed regarding this proposal.

Mr. Brooks submitted pictures showing the proposed street extension on his property, and a survey showing the dimensions of the lots.

Five persons present in regard to this proposed rezoning.

Property owner, 3108 Amherst Drive, spoke in objection.

Property owner, 3231 Sheffer Street, representing those property owners on Sheffer Street, stated they would like to be kept informed regarding this matter.

Mr. Brooks stated the property immediately adjacent to his parcel is zoned D-M Multiple District.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-57-68

No one appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the 5300 block of Balzer Street from "A-1" Family to D-M:1 Multiple Dwelling District.

Betty Lifford, 5224 Balzer Street spoke in objection to the proposal. Presented a petition in objection containing 26 signatures.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-58-68

This is a petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 1215-17 Cleo Street and 1831 W. Willow Street from "F" Commercial to B-1 Family residence.

Berneice V. Hake, 1217 Cleo Street, stated she would like the property zoned residential, as proposed.

Mr. Davis, real estate agent for Texaco Inc., 950 28th St. S.E., Grand Rapids, stated he was present primarily as an observer. It would be somewhat of a hardship to take a commercial property, which is located in a commercial and industrial area, which fronts on a highly traveled arterial, adjacent to a railroad track, and zone it to residential. We believe our property is a natural barrier to shield the residential property from the industrial properties across the street and the high volume of traffic on Willow Street. The other two properties in question on this petition are now used as residential and

should remain so, however, we do not want our property rezoned from Commercial to Residential.

Gerald Denninger, 1215 Cleo, owner of one of properties being considered for rezoning, stated he owns and operated wrecker service, and could see no reason for property to be rezoned residential when it is already semi-commercial. Thought it should be zoned commercial for expansion and betterment of the property. He spoke in defense of his wrecker service.

Builder of four houses in 1200 block of Cleo Street stated he did not know the zoning was commercial. Has been on the street over thirty years.

Mr. Fountain of the Planning staff stated the property in question was zoned commercial in 1942.

Don Hanson, 1140 Cleo Street; Mrs. Frank Gunn, 3347 Wordell Road who originally lived at 1217 Cleo Street; William A. Remus, 1201 Cleo Street; D. J. Wilkinson, 1204 Cleo Street; Donald A. Brown, 1141 Cleo Street; Etta Goff, 1207 Cleo Street; spoke in support of the proposed rezoning and in objection to the wrecker service.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-59-68

Lyman Duncan, representative of Pentecost Delevelopment appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the north side of E. Jolly Road, west of I-496 from residential to D-M Multiple Dwelling District.

Mr. Gaus asked how many units were proposed and was informed eleven buildings with 121 units, 121 carports, 129 open parking spaces.

Mr. Nino informed the Board that this plan was presented to the Planning Department on the basis that the developer was going to consider D-M:1 or a Community Unit Plan approach, however the petition was then filed for D-M Multiple District. Therefore the density quoted above relates to the D-M:1 District whereas the D-M District would allow greater density.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-60-68

Dr. Robert Wirt appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property north of 4909 S. Logan Street from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional Office District. He stated he proposes a building which will be beneficial for the area, that would not conflict with South Logan Street Land Use Policy of the Board, and he needs the additional room for expansion purposes.

No one spoke in opposition.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-61-68

Mr. George Giddings appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 508 S. Walnut Street from "D" Apartment to "J" Parking District. Mr. Giddings stated that the subject property is across from the school and is an enlargement of the present parking facility.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-62-68

Ed Bockmeier, representing Alco Construction Company appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 920 W. Holmes Road from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial District. Need this small parcel rezoned to permit the erection of an identification sign.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from Lansing Community College regarding the Planning Board's submission of Lansing Community College for a Design Award. Received and placed on file.

Letter from Charter Township of Lansing regarding hearing on the zoning of the Waverly Golf Course to be held June 19, 1968 at the Township Hall, 2909 W. Genesee Street, Lansing, Michigan.

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Brown announced that Mr. Holcomb, Civil Defense Director, who was scheduled to address the Board was unable to be present due to illness and would be rescheduled at a later date.

Recess 9:45 to 10:05 p.m.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-45-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Duncan that the application from Larry D. Fowler for approval to a community plan located at the southeast corner of Miller and Grovenberg Roads as filed be amended, and the Board invite a Community Unit Plan which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.
2. That the gross density not exceed 8 dwelling units per acre. Which would be consistent with existing and proposed development of the area.
3. That the applicant work out details of housing types (two family or town-house dwellings) and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

The established land use development surrounding the site is single family residential, therefore any change that would permit multi-family use of the property would be contrary to the existing land use pattern, and allow structural development out of character with development in the area.

The change could foster uncontrolled development in the area, and may therefore deter the improvement or development of other properties in accord with the existing zoning regulations.

The change would adversely affect living conditions in the immediate area, principally through the increase in traffic and activity. This is especially true if other properties in the area are given favorable consideration, which would in effect change the character of the area.

It is further pointed out that apartment development would not contribute to the social status of the existing neighborhood. Apartment dwellers are generally transients, and do not participate in neighborhood activities. This is especially true in the case where the proposal is to construct two bedroom units, producing very few school age children, which is generally considered to be one of the major factors of encouraging community participation.

Density and building types should be given serious consideration. This is especially true where there is an established land use pattern. The Board believes that a limited density on this site, with structural development compatible with existing development, (in other words, family oriented), would reduce any serious adverse affects on the existing residential area.

The site has ease of access to a major street (Miller Road) which is a basic consideration given when any increase in residential density is proposed.

The extension of Edgewood Blvd. northwesterly to Logan Street will eventually be developed. Therefore any major development within the vicinity should be given careful consideration.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-46-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 933 Northrup Street and adjacent property from A-1 Family to C-2 Family District be denied.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Duncan seconded by Fink that this petition be tabled for further consideration.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-47-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Heino that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by 20th Century Builders Inc. to rezone a parcel at 5715 S. Washington Avenue from "A-1" Family Residential District to "D-M" Multiple District be denied.

We might first point out that the staff has done some preliminary studies of this area regarding re-platting of the subject property, and the area adjacent to the east and north. Preliminary studies indicate that the subject property would produce approximately 12 residential lots.

The lots east of the site fronting on Shaffer Road are extremely deep and provide more land area than the average home owner desires or is capable of maintaining. The property owner immediately to the east, whose property is isolated except for a narrow frontage on Shaffer Road, has indicated his desire to cooperate with the development of this area.

In regard to land use, the proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern which is predominantly single family residential.

The proposed change would foster uncontrolled development in the area thereby increasing the load on public facilities (schools, sewers, streets).

It is quite evident that the developer has taken a subjective view of the situation, and has expressed very little concern for existing and potential development, and improvement of this area will be deterred.

The Board does not believe there are any substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with existing regulations. Petitions containing 129 signatures opposing this rezoning request

were filed at the public hearing May 7, 1968.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-48-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. and Mrs. Sam Rassizi, to rezone a parcel in the 5800 block Joshua Street described as:

Lots 55, 56, 57, 58, 59 and 60 of the Supervisor's Plat Number 3, T3N, R2W

from "A-1" Family District to "C-2" Residential District be denied.

The Board believes that any differences between one and two family homes are minor and that in some cases one and two family homes can be mixed. However, most of these situations will occur in areas which are largely undeveloped or in pre-planned developments. The situation then becomes one of "buyer beware" i.e., single family home purchasers can be aware of the probable land use prior to the actual purchase.

Clearly, this application for rezoning is not one of these situations, as considerable single dwelling development does exist and furthermore, property owners have expressed their opposition to this application.

Based on the existing land use of the area which is predominately single family residential, the Board would point out that this change would be a clear case of "Block Busting."

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-49-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the petition filed by Tedd T. White, to rezone property at 3109 W. Miller Road from "A-1" Family to D-M:1 Multiple District be tabled thirty days as per the request of the petitioner.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-50-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City

Council that the petition by Leo Farhat, Attorney, acting for Eric Kindlund, to rezone a parcel in the 3700, 3800 blocks of Delta River Drive described as:

Lots 1 and 2: 3700 block of Delta River Drive,

Lots 5 and 6: 3800 Block of Delta River Drive,

Lots 1, 2, 5 and 6 of Virginia Village Subdivision, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan

from "A-1" Family Residential to "D-M" Multiple and "C-2" Family be denied.

It would appear that from testimony by residents in the area that the contributing factor to this was the undetermined land use development for the property to the north.

The City Council has since considered multiple zoning for the property to the north and found it desirable to retain single family zoning adjacent to the existing single family development.

The proposed change would be contrary to the established land use pattern (with the exception of the two churches) which is predominately single family residential. The land adjacent to the north of the subject property is also proposed for single family development.

A change of zoning as proposed could foster uncontrolled development in the immediate vicinity creating a mixed and undesirable land use relationship, which may adversely affect property values.

The Board does not believe that there are any substantial reasons why the property cannot be developed in accord with existing zoning regulations.

Several residents in the area objected to the proposed change, and presented a transcript of deed restrictions which, among other restrictions, limit development of the subject property to single family residential.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-52-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William G. Trent, to rezone a parcel in the 1933 West Holmes Road, from "A-1" Family Residential to "D-M" multiple dwelling be denied as filed and "D-M:1" multiple be granted. The Board wishes to emphasize however, that any additional rezoning on Holmes Road should be preceded by assemblage of the land.

The pressures of urbanization, to which this area of South Lansing has been subjected have become quite evident over the past few years. The transformation of farmlands to housing projects, the introduction of multiple family dwellings and commercial facilities has been swift. To keep pace with this growth the City has had to extend utilities, provide expanded police and fire protection and widen streets.

This urbanization, however, has not been all pervasive. Certain areas have been by passed by land developers for a variety of reasons. The subject property and those adjacent to it is one of these passed over areas and one of the principal reasons is related to the configuration of the land ownerships. This land was divided into large parcels with extreme depth to width ratios. Development of these parcels with single family homes along the Holmes Road frontage then took place. Consequently, when the population growth required additional housing, land developers passed over these properties, which were in effect largely vacant and developable, in favor of the large vacant farm lands which were held in single ownership and therefore posed no assembly problems.

As the area beyond developed, Holmes Road was transformed from a two lane rural road to a modern four lane major street which now carried high volumes of traffic. As may be expected with the changes in traffic volume the living environment declined and within the past two years several petitions have been presented to the Council requesting changes in zoning to permit offices and apartments.

From a planning point of view, these areas are well suited for a higher density virtue of their accessibility to the Holmes Road and their proximity to commercial facilities. However, the problems associated with individual ownership of narrow deep lots will not be solved by simply rezoning the area for a higher density. In fact, if this approach were used, the resultant development of individual parcels with single buildings, separate parking areas, separate access points to Holmes Road, a discontinuity of architectural style and a general lack of usable open space would be highly unsatisfactory in terms of livability for future residents and in terms of good urban design.

In short, there are no easy solutions to the problems of this area, and this application. The alternatives as we see them are as follows:

- a. Deny this application with the hope of encouraging assemblage of the land.
- b. Rezone the site to "D-M:1" which will provide a lesser density than requested and will permit some basic design review.
- c. Rezone the property as requested.

Alternative "b" is, in our opinion, the only one which attempts to address itself to the problems and while it does not offer a completely satisfactory solution, it does reduce the problems by permitting site design review.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-53-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by John Bondarenko, to rezone a parcel in the 5300 block Granger Drive described as:

Lots No. 2 through 12 Roselawn Subdivision, Lansing, Michigan,

from "A-1" Family to "D-M:1" Multiple District be denied as filed and that Lot 2 through 6 inclusive lying West of Granger Drive be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "C-2" Family District and Lots 7 through 12 inclusive lying east of Granger Drive remain in the present zoning classification "A-1" family residential.

One purpose of zoning is to secure a reasonable development pattern by keeping similar and related uses together and separating dissimilar and unrelated uses.

The existing land use on either side of the subject property is not totally related, therefore it is reasonable to assume that a transitional land use would be appropriate. The question is what degree of land use intensity is reasonable in this situation? It is first pointed out that the residents in the area are opposed to the change and have filed petitions to the effect.

The proposed change would allow development out of character with the existing single family development and could adversely affect property values. This is especially true in this case, as the single family neighborhood is extremely small, and any further isolation will reduce its desirability as single family use.

In terms of density, the proposed change would permit approximately 14 dwelling units per acre, and could set the stage for future development to the north. This could become serious when taking a total view of the situation, based on the fact that there are no public facilities in the immediate area.

The Public Service Department has indicated that sanitary sewer is adequate to accommodate an increased density, but existing storm sewer, which serves this area, is inadequate. Therefore any major development in the area of service would compound the problem. In the case of

multi-family development where additional impervious conditions are created by building mass and hard surfaced parking lots, the storm sewer condition would become more acute.

The site has ease of access to Armstrong Road which serves as a collector street between Cedar Street and Pennsylvania Avenue. Therefore the impact of traffic and activity on adjacent properties would be minimum.

The Board believes that this change will allow reasonable use of the land, compatible with existing development and minimum affect on public utilities.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-54-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Helen Nicholas and Beverly Ries to rezone a parcel in the 816 and 820 N. Pennsylvania Avenue, from "C-2" Family Residential to "D-M:1" multiple dwelling district be granted.

Review of this application as it relates to the Master Plan reveals that the Master Plan recommends a maximum density of 10 dwelling units per acre. The area is presently developed with a density of approximately 9-10 dwelling units per acre.

The Community Renewal Program's treatment proposals suggest extensive rehabilitation and redevelopment in this neighborhood. With this in mind it would appear that this application is in line with public policy. However, sewer facilities are presently overloaded, which suggests that any redevelopment which would produce a higher density would be premature at best. In fact, the Planning Board in the past year has recommended denial of two requests for higher density in the immediate vicinity of the subject property.

Unfortunately, no relief is programmed for immediate future due to the pressing needs of other areas, some of which have no sewers at all.

The above is based on the premise that rehabilitation will occur. Conversations with the petitioner reveals that he does not contemplate redevelopment but is interested in minor rehabilitation. Therefore this application if granted would not necessarily mean an increased load on the sewer facilities. "D-M:1" zoning would permit an additional 5 units and it is questionable as to whether or not this would be sufficient incentive to redevelop the property. We do not think it would, but

rather that it will help foster rehabilitation of the existing units.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-14-67

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the South Logan Street Zoning Policy Plan be tabled to the June 18, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

SS-16-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the request for a special use permit on Miller Road west of S. Logan Street be tabled to the June 18, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

STREET COMMITTEE

S-5-67P

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the request by Beneicke and Krue for an extension of time for the preliminary plat of Four Seasons Subdivision be granted for a period of one year.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Duncan and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES

BP-5-68

Motion by Duncan seconded by Gaus that the offer of Mr. Robert Heinig to sell the property at 921 W. Jenison Avenue to the City of Lansing for park purposes be approved providing negotiations can bring about a suitable purchase price.

The parcel of land has a 40 ft. frontage on N. Jenison Avenue and a depth of 131 ft. and is occupied by a single family two story dwelling. The westerly property line abuts Hull Court Park. At the present time access to Hull Court Park is from Hyland Street or Hull Court. The acquisition of this property would allow access to the park from North Jenison Avenue which is needed, and would make the park more readily accessible to the people living on North Jenison and to the east.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Duncan and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL COMMITTEE

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Planning Board at their meeting on April 16, 1968 made the following recommendation in regard to Urban Renewal Project No. 2:

1. The revision of the project boundaries to Cedar Street;
2. The reservation of land for Ottawa Street extension;
3. The relocation of the City Market;
4. To seek and amendatory for additional funds; and
5. Total clearance and redevelopment with office commercial and public land uses.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Fink that the Planning Board now approve the Vilcan Leman preliminary site plan which is in conformity with the Board's recommendation for land use. The Board also recommended to Council that funds be transferred from the Central City Bridge

Construction or General Revenue to renovate the Shiawassee Street Bridge.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Brown mentioned the Forest View Committee meeting to be held on June 5, 1968 at 7:30 p.m. at the Forest View School.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that Mr. Duncan be excused from the June 18, 1968 meeting of the Planning Board since he will be out of town on that date.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Gaus asked that a gavel and a letter of appreciation be forwarded to Mr. Rolland Siebert.

Meeting adjourned at 11 p.m.

N/M

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 16, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:40 p.m. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

This matter was referred to the Zoning
Committee.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Gaus,
Heino, Reynolds—6.

Absent: Duncan, Fink—2.

SS-27-67

D-M:1 Review Procedures. Mr. Nino stated that this site plan review procedure requirement is about the same as for Community Unit Plans, except it is carried one step further in that types of screening and parking allocations are required.

HEARINGS

P-7-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Heino that a Public Hearing be held on the Preliminary Plat of Bardaville Plaza on August 6, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Guernsey noted that it has been the Planner's experience that some developers prefer to work within some standards of design and some violently oppose this type of requirements. Across the country there is a strong belief in zoning requirement standards.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-70-68

Proposed Industrial Park at 1601 Willoughby Road. Mr. Nino of the Planning Staff stated that a procedure should be established for dealing with the aforementioned type of petition as a type of planned unit development. In this type of matter, a developer has to produce a considerable amount of plans which involves a considerable sum of money. We believe the same approach should be taken as with a community unit plan consideration, that the developer should be given some indication of the Board's feelings on the matter before he is asked to invest in illustrated plans. Mr. Nino felt that this type of development could be of significant importance to the City of Lansing and that the proposed use is not inconsistent with the regional master plan. He suggested the Board members view the site in question.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the availability of sites for industrial parks, and suggested the Staff study the anticipated needs of industry.

Mr. Guernsey noted that this information is available from Tri-County Regional Planning Commission.

Mr. Reynolds questioned if this is the type of matter that should be taken up with the Land Development Review Committee and Mr. Guernsey replied that it definitely should be, but that the problem right now is that there are several sites pending finalization.

Matter referred to the Ordinance Committee for report at next Board meeting.

SS-52-67

North East Street Zoning Policy Study. Mr. Nino advised that some months ago the City Council requested the Planning Staff to conduct a study of North East Street. The Staff believes it would be desirable to conduct an area study of the North East Street Corridor. Various members of the Staff will be responsible for different areas of study. The proposed boundary of the study was described. The Staff is now engaged in an inventory of the existing land use characteristics of this area and will make a progress report to the Board from time to time. Much citizen participation in the planning decision making process is recommended in this study.

Mr. Reynolds remarked on the need for traffic count projections for the North East Street Area and was advised by Mr. Guernsey they are currently being gathered.

Mr. Duncan questioned the proposed study boundary.

Motion by Duncan seconded by Gaus that the Planning Department Staff proceed with the North East Street Corridor Study and report back to the Board at a later date.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Blackall was excused from the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-6-68F

Kimberly Downs No. 5, Final Plat. Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the Final Plat of Kimberly Downs No. 5 be approved subject to the following:

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$3,500.00
Monuments	490.00
	\$3,990.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929 as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

SS-29-68

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Black that the plans for the Mt. Hope Avenue-Moores River Drive Relocation be approved as shown with the stipulation that all possible pedestrian walkway be provided on the north side of Moores River Drive extended between Mt. Hope Avenue and Waverly Road.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

URBAL RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported there would be a special Committee of The Whole meeting on July 18, 1968 at 8:00 p.m. regarding the Ottawa Street Bridge.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The following was submitted as an amendment in accordance with Section 8.0 of the Policy and Procedure of the Planning Board, to be numbered 3.7-1. "3.7-1 Except at public meeting of the Board, its members do not discuss the resolution of specific zoning cases scheduled or likely to come before the Board, with applicants, their representatives, or others with a direct interest." This type of amendment is employed by the Los Angeles Planning Commission.

Discussion followed as to whether or not this proposed amendment would effectively serve its purpose.

Mr. Gaus suggested the same type of rule for the Board of Zoning Appeals.

It was suggested the Board contact Los Angeles for information regarding the enforcement of the proposed rule and the reaction to it.

Motion by Duncan supported by Black that this matter be referred to the Executive Committee pending further information.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

NEW BUSINESS

Motion by Duncan seconded by Black that the following resolution be adopted and forwarded to City Council.

Whereas the campus site development of the Lansing Community College is appropriately being developed with attractive landscaping, screening walls, walkways, and other improvements which are exemplary of good civic design; and

Whereas the campus plan and site improvements are being developed with a conscious awareness of the need to improve Lansing's environment in the future and today;

Whereas the campus development represents foresight and an understanding of today's urban design needs;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Lansing Community College Board of Trustees, its staff, architects, and site planners be commended for their wise, progressive, and foresighted planning.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Central City Plan Office District Effectuation. Mr. Nino presented to the Board parcels in the Central City which are inconsistent with the Central City Plan. He described the present zoning and suggested rezoning petitions be initiated by the Board to implement office zoning in the Central City Plan.

Mr. Black questioned the office district in Urban Renewal projects.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Black seconded by Heino that the Staff be directed to compile further information on this matter for later presentation to the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

RE: SS-14-67

South Logan Street Land Use Policy. Mr. Nino described properties on South Logan Street which are contradictory to the recently adopted South Logan Plan. He described their present zoning and their proposed zoning. He suggested rezoning petitions be initiated by the Board to bring the subject parcels into conformance with the South Logan Street Plan.

This matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that there has been excellent cooperation from Michigan State University Extension Service in connection with the City Market Study. The funds for the study have been authorized by City Council and this study is slated to be finalized around the end of September.

A letter from G. Michael Conlisk, East Lansing Planning Director regarding poor communication among area planners and planning commissions, was read by Mr. Guernsey. The letter requested that the Tri County Regional Planning Commission consider an annual meeting for all area planners and planning commissions to discuss matters of mutual concern and responsibility.

Motion by Black seconded by Gaus that Mr. Boylan, Chairman of the Tri County Regional Planning Commission be notified that the Planning Board concurs in this matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Duncan noted that there was soon to be a presentation by CBS-TV in seven series on the different aspects of the American negro. He recommended the Board view this program if possible.

Meeting adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, July 2, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:38 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Absent: Duncan—1.

ELECTION OF OFFICERS

The chair was turned over to the Secretary for the annual election of officers.

The floor was opened to nominations for Chairman.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that Mrs. Ramona J. Bretz be nominated for the office of Chairman and that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Mrs. Bretz.

Motion carried unanimously.

The floor was then opened to nominations for Vice Chairman.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Bretz that Mr. Kenneth C. Black be nominated for the

office of Vice Chairman and that the nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Mr. Black.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Black seconded by Reynolds that Raymond C. Guernsey be reappointed as Secretary of the Planning Board.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mrs. Bretz assumed the chair.

HEARINGS

Z-63-68

Mr. James Rosa, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 818 Center Street from "C-2" Family to "F-1" Commercial District. Mr. Rosa stated the subject property is located on the corner of a major artery, and that the entire block is surrounded by light industrial zoning, therefore this property is not suited for residential purposes. The present zoning across the street is professional and commercial. The proposed commercial use would be an improvement for this area and for the City.

Mr. Heino questioned the specific proposal for this property. Mr. Rosa stated he was not entirely at liberty to mention specifics at this time, but it is to be a specialty shop and service business, with less than 20% walk in business, primarily a service business.

Mrs. Bump, 816 Center Street spoke in regard to the proposed rezoning. Mr. Bump pointed out that the rest of the specific block is still residential.

There were six persons present interested in this rezoning.

Mr. Black asked that the legal description in the staff report be checked before presentation of this matter to the Zoning Committee.

Matter referred to Zoning Committee.

Z-65-68

Mr. Anderson, Bank of Lansing, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 216-221 N. Clippert Street from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial District.

Mr. Blackall questioned the ingress and egress of the proposed drive-in banking facility.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-65-68

The petitioner did not appear in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1009 Pierce Road from A-1 Residential to "F" Commercial District.

Property owner at 1029 Pierce Road spoke in objection due to the fact that if this property is zoned "F" Commercial anything could eventually be put on the site other than the parking and building expansion requested.

Mr. Black questioned the building expansion and suggested the Staff check on the extent of expansion proposed.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-66-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3106 N. East Street from "A-1" Residential to "F" Commercial District.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-67-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 117 Ferguson from "C-2" Family to "J" Parking District.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-68-68

Petitioner did not appear in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1017 E. Kalamazoo Street from "C-2" Family to "D-1" Professional Office District.

It was brought to the Board's attention that the petitioner had asked about the possibilities of a special use permit rather than rezoning.

Property owner at 305 S. Pennsylvania asked if the proposed use would involve much parking of cars, and was informed there would be little traffic generated by the Safety Council who wish to use the building as office.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-69-68

William Nakfoor petitioner appeared in behalf of his petition to rezone property at 920 Center Street from "C-2" Family to "D-M:1" Multiple Dwelling District. He stated it is his intent to remove the house

presently on the site. There is other multiple housing in the area.

Mr. Knaup, 116 W. Kilborn, questioned what effect this proposal would have on the rest of the block.

Mr. Lynch, 406 Adams stated it was his understanding that this property was proposed for commercial use. Mr. Guernsey explained that any individual can petition for rezoning on a specific lot basis. The Master Plan does not show residential use proposed for this area. There is a study to be conducted regarding the development of this area.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-70-68

Mr. R. N. Kieppe, property owner of 1601 E. Willoughby, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1601 E. Willoughby Road from "A-1" Residential to Light Industrial Park. Mr. Kieppe stated that light industrial would be a suitable use for this subject land. He then introduced Mr. Sebald of Sebald and Kage, General Contractors, the developers of the proposed industrial park. Mr. Sebald distributed to the Board pictures of the type of buildings to be constructed in the proposed industrial park. A property owner on Kingdon Avenue questioned the access to the proposed park, and was informed it would be both off Cedar Street and off Willoughby Road.

Sheila Adams, 6835 Kingdon questioned their residences having industrial development on both sides. Mr. Sebald stated there would be a buffer strip between the industrial and the residential properties.

Mr. Robert Sheldon, 7008 Kingdon spoke in objection to the proposed use. Mr. Bennett, 6900 Kingdon, Gerald Wyman, 7137 Willoughby, Mrs. Kennedy, 6901 Kingdon, Mrs. Adams, 6835 Kingdon, Mr. Courter 7024 Kingdon, all spoke in objection.

Discussion followed.

Approximately 30 persons were present interested in this matter.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 9:00 to 9:30 p.m.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Black seconded by Reynolds that the minutes of April 16, 1968 be approved as printed.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

SS-14-67

Motion by Heino seconded by Black that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the land on South Logan Street be rezoned as shown in the Logan Street Plan adopted by the Board with the exception of those lands now in use for commercial purposes, which shall remain non-conforming or as presently zoned.

The following resolution was adopted by the Planning Board:

Whereas the Planning Board for the City of Lansing on May 21, 1968 held a public hearing in respect of its plan for the rezoning of South Logan Street, and

Whereas as a consequence of this meeting certain modifications are deemed desirable to make the plan more acceptable to the people in the Logan Street area.

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Planning Board for the City of Lansing hereby recommends to the Council of the City of Lansing that it proceed to carry out the recommendations of the Logan Street Zoning Plan with respect to the proposed uses of the land only and to serve as a policy for determining requests for rezoning, with the exception of those lands now used for commercial purposes which shall remain non conforming or as they are presently zoned, otherwise all other land shall be zoned in accord with the plan.

Mr. Reynolds disagreed with the phasing of existing businesses. Thought they should be given a chance to conform or rebuild. Mr. Black pointed out that the ultimate result of that type of policy would defeat the purpose of the Logan Street Policy Plan, and that if it were made available to non conforming uses on Logan Street then it would have to be made available to other non conforming uses.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino—6.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

SS-16-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request filed by Johnnie Johns for seasonal use of property on Miller Road, west of Logan Street and adjacent to the I-96 freeway as a golf driving range, be approved under Section 36-42 (9) of the Zoning Ordinance. The land in question may be used for various forms of recreational uses to include a golf driving range, but not to include entertainment uses such as ferris wheels, and similar mechanical ride equipment and that such permit may be terminated at the discretion of the Council after the expiration of five years.

The Zoning Code permits seasonal recreation uses by special permit. Such a land use technique offers a very desirable kind of zoning flexibility and is most appropriate we suggest, for the kind of land use proposed in this application.

It is obvious that all land experiences transitional uses until a more profitable and more economic use appears. Zoning regulations are not to necessarily negate this process, but rather to direct it into a pattern of land uses that will promote the public interest while creating a more desirable urban environment.

This is particularly true of the rural lands on the fringes of the urbanized City. Farming is continued until it becomes more profitable to develop the land for some more intensive use. More often, the transitional use is appropriate such as certain kinds of recreational land uses.

In order to ensure that such transitional uses are not permitted to affect adjacent urban uses, time limits can be imposed and this is what makes the special use permit so desirable. In this method the City can cause to be terminated any special use when it appears that it is more desirable to encourage an urban use of the property.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-46-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Black that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Philip Vercruysse and James W. Fox, to rezone a parcel at 933 Northrup Street from "A-1" Family Residential to "C-2" Family Residential be denied.

The change would be contrary to the established land use pattern, which is predominately single family residential.

The Board believes that the proposed change would be an infringement on the private home owner, and could eventually threaten the stability of the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-49-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Blackall that the petition to rezone property at 3109 W. Miller Road from "A-1" Family to "D-M:1" multiple district be tabled thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-51-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Blackall that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Cora A. Wullaert and Harry F. Thompson to rezone a parcel at 2620-2634 N. Grand River Avenue from "F" Commercial District and "J" Parking District to "E-2" Drive in Shop District be denied.

The site under consideration is located within the strip commercial development along this area of North Grand River Avenue. Much of this development occurred prior to annexation without consideration given to the adjacent residential properties and the widening of N. Grand River, a major thoroughfare. The end result is a mixed and undesirable land use development, with inadequate setbacks, off street parking, landscaping and screening of adjacent residential properties.

The proposal before the Board presents a problem which is three fold.

1. There are a concentration of five service stations in the vicinity, some of which have been or are vacant, which leads one to believe that the market is well taken care of. Although the applicant did point out that their market analysis indicated a sound investment.
2. It is true that the change would promote redevelopment of the land which may otherwise remain vacant and continue to create a blighting influence on the community, but it should be further pointed out that: the re-occurrence of this problem is quite possible based on the fact that:
 - a. The proposed construction of the new service station would not lend itself to a conversion to another use, if the market failed to support the service station use.
 - b. The fact also remains that the type of station is not neighborhood oriented, and even if it were, the neighborhood is relatively small, and provides very little support for the number of stations in the vicinity. Therefore the large percentage of business will depend on through traffic.
3. This acute angle four way intersection with a grade level railway crossing possesses unique traffic safety problems which would be greatly amplified with automobile service stations within proximity of all of these intersections. The great number of turning movements and curb cuts, stimulated by automobile service stations is a real traffic safety problem at an intersection which already poses a considerable traffic problem. It will be near impossible for cars to get into the traffic stream from these sta-

tions at peak hours of the day without the drivers taking extreme chances.

The property is presently zoned "F" Commercial and "J" parking and is located within the established strip commercial development. Therefore it would be unreasonable to permit readjustment of zoning district which would encourage reuse of the property that would provide a service to the neighborhood, and possibly eliminate undue concentration of similar uses, which could have the affect of cutting into the existing market to a degree where additional vacancies would be created.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-56-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Black that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by Charles E. Brooks to rezone a parcel at the 3200 block of Amherst Drive from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple District be denied as filed and that the portion of the property lying west of Amherst Drive extended be rezoned from A-1 Family to D-M:1 Multiple, and that the area lying east be rezoned from A-1 Family to C-2 Family subject to the land being platted prior to any zoning change, reflecting satisfactory street access to the north, and lots adequate in size to accommodate proposed development.

Discussion followed on the compatibility of the above motion which proposes D-M:1 on the west side of Amherst extended, with the D-M adjacent to it.

Motion by Fink seconded by Blackall that this petition be tabled thirty days in order for the petitioner to provide a site plan for D-M zoning.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Heino that the rules be suspended to allow Charles Brooks the petitioner, to speak in regard to this matter.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Charles Brooks, the petitioner, stated that due to economics of this situation, he had to request that a decision be reached on this matter one way or the other at this time. He presented a survey of the land in question.

Mr. Black stated that since Mr. Brooks had presented the survey of the land and

since he agreed to the C-2 on the east part of the property, then the question is whether D-M or D-M:1 zoning be permitted for the west side of Amherst extended.

Motion by Black seconded by Reynolds that this matter be taken from the table and again considered by the Board at this time.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Fink seconded by Reynolds that the petition by Charles E. Brooks to rezone a parcel at the 3200 block of Amherst Drive from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple District be denied as filed, and that the portion of the property lying west of Amherst Drive extended be rezoned from A-1 Family to D-M Multiple District, and the area lying east be rezoned from A-1 Family to C-2 Family District subject to the land being platted prior to any zoning change, reflecting satisfactory street access to the north, and lots adequate in size to accommodate proposed development.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-58-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition filed by the Planning Board to rezone parcels at 12-15-1217 Cleo Street and 1831 W. Willow Street from F Commercial District to B-1 Family District be granted. The Board cannot find where the change will affect any investment of the property owners involved, and will give added protection to other property owners in the vicinity.

The property under consideration (according to records) was zoned commercial with the adoption of the present zoning Ordinance in 1942. The reasons for the change are unknown, and have very little significance at this time.

The protests recently by residents in the neighborhood regarding the use of the property at 1215 Cleo Street for a wrecker service have prompted action, that could restore the single family character of the properties. It is first pointed out that the properties have not developed in commercial nature. Possibly due to the fact that they were zoned prematurely and the market of support did not exist, or the owner or owners were ignorant of the fact that the land was zoned commercial.

In any event the property developed in a residential nature with the exception of the north lot which contains a warehouse, and the wrecker service which now operates out of 1215 Cleo Street. Any change

at this time will not eliminate these uses, but would insure against the intrusion of other undesirable commercial uses.

The Board believes that this change is in keeping with reasonable and sound zoning principals by providing protection to the established residential area and retaining its stability. At the Planning Board Public Hearing June 4, 1968 several residents appeared in favor of this change, as did the property owner at 1217 Cleo Street. The other property owners involved in the change were opposed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-59-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by J. D. Pentecost to rezone a parcel at the northwest corner of Jolly Road and I-496 from A-1 Family District to D-M Multiple District be denied and that a Community Unit Plan is invited for the property which addresses itself to the following:

1. The Community Unit Plan submission is consistent with the Board's adopted policy.
2. That the gross density not exceed 12 dwelling units per acre.
3. That the applicant work out details of housing types and site plan standards with the Planning Department.
4. That prior to formal submission of the required plans the Board shall give its approval to the details worked out between the Planning Department and the petitioner.

The site under consideration is located east and adjacent to property that is being developed for multi-family purposes. At the time consideration was given for this project, the Staff encouraged an integrated plan which would include the property now under consideration. Due to a lack of coordination between property owners this did not materialize, and development plans were approved (under the Community Unit Plan section of the Ordinance) for the property to the west. The plans were approved subject to several conditions, that which included density controls, building types, landscaping, platting of the land to insure necessary public right of way, and other conditions that were felt to be pertinent to the type of development proposed.

D-M multiple zoning as requested does not insure these qualities, and permits a land use density which is more than double that of the approved project.

The Board is of the opinion that the property under consideration should be considered on the same basis as the area to the west. This would insure a compatible land use relationship, and negate any possibility of discriminating between this

developer and that to the west and already approved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-60-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 4900 block of South Logan Street from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional Office, be denied as filed and that the east 10 ft. of the property be rezoned from A-1 Family to J Parking and the balance of the property rezoned from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that this petition be tabled 30 days in view of the adoption of the South Logan Street Zoning Policy.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-61-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone a parcel at 508 E. Walnut Street from D-1 Professional District to J Parking District be granted. Screening to be provided along the north and south property line, and along the east property line except at ingress and egress points.

The property under consideration is located within the area proposed for offices and services, as indicated on the central city development plan.

The change as requested will not effectively change the proposed land use character of the area, as off street parking is one of the requirements that accompany the type of development proposed for this area.

The Board would further point out that the existing block which contains West Junior High School, and the Kalamazoo Street Elementary School is developed to the point where expansion of off street parking facilities on the site are not possible.

The Board does not believe the change will adversely affect any surrounding property, but will help alleviate on street parking problems that may occur.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Z-62-68

Motion by Heino seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Alan Ginsberg, Holmes and Logan Company to rezone a

parcel at 920 W. Holmes Road from J Parking to F Commercial District be denied as filed and that the east 108 ft. of the property be rezoned from J Parking to F Commercial District.

This area was originally planned as an integrated shopping complex, but as a result of indiscriminate zoning, some strip commercial development has occurred. Along with this development are numerous advertising signs. It is generally considered reasonable to allow shopping centers or business communities to erect signs to attract attention of shoppers. But unhappily, what has occurred in some shopping areas and along commercial strips is that one shop has tried to outdo the other, and the result is a clutter of illuminated trademarks, blinking bulbs, and assorted brand names—one more garish than the next.

This area is fast approaching this situation, but it is also pointed out that the property east of Logan Street is under development, and has not constructed signs of any nature. The Board believes that policy should be established now, and any further consideration beyond this regarding the placement of signs, should be based on an overall development plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-2-68

Waverly Heights No. 10, Final Plat.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the final plat of Waverly Heights No. 10 be approved subject to the following conditions:

Subject to the posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalk	\$1,200.00
Curb and Gutter	800.00
Monuments	185.00
	\$2,185.00

in accordance with Section 37-35 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

P-1-68

Sunset Hills No. 7 Final Plat. Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the final plat of Sunset Hills No. 7 be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. Subdivision to be developed with complete public improvements.
2. That permanent, public access be pro-

vided to Lot 212, along the Haze Drain easement.

3. That Lot 212 be used as open space.
4. That financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$4,000.00
Curb and Gutter	900.00
Monuments and Lot corners	520.00
Sanitary Sewer	500.00
	\$5,920.00

be provided, in accordance with Section 37-35 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

P-3-68

Fredricksburg, Preliminary Plat. Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the Preliminary Plat of Fredricksburg be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The subdivision should be developed with complete public utilities and street improvements in accordance with Article 6 of the Subdivision Control Ordinance.
2. The existing north and main truck sewer and the Duffy drain and their respective easements are to be shown on the face of the final plat.
3. Five (5) foot side and rear lot line easements for public utilities should be provided.
4. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. The proposed lot lines should be rearranged to reflect the existence of the north and main truck sewers and the Duffy drain and to insure that each lot will contain a reasonable amount of buildable area.
6. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Council approval.

Further, the Planning Board recommends to Council that sufficient land area to facilitate the widening of Raymond Drive be provided subject to the following conditions:

1. All shrubbery removed from the existing fire station shall be removed in a manner which will allow reuse and turned over to the Fire Department.
2. To compensate for parking area lost as a result of the widening, additional area at the rear of the fire station shall be graded and surfaced.
3. The rear drive from the fire station

shall be regarded and surfaced to allow fire apparatus to move without dragging.

4. All work must be carried on in such manner so as to allow the station to remain "in service" at all times.
5. The widening and installation of improvements should be the responsibility of the subdivider of Fredericksburg Subdivision.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

P-4-68

Preliminary Plat of Glendale Manor.
Motion by Gaus seconded by Black that the preliminary plat of Glendale Manor be approved subject to the following:

1. That the subdivision be developed with complete public utilities and full street improvements in accordance with Article 6 of the Subdivision Ordinance.
2. Street right of way should be 60 feet and pavement width should be 32 feet. A 43 foot dedication for Northrup Street should be provided.
3. The final plat should reflect the following design changes:
 - a. Eliminate Doris Street, east of Rolfe extended.
 - b. Provide a stub street from Rolfe to the east line at a point near the southern end of the site.
 - c. Provide a stub street from Rolfe to the east line at a point approximately 400 feet south of Northrup.
 - d. Terminate Rolfe Road at a point south of Northrup Street and provide a permanent cul-de-sac at that point.
4. All lots should be graded so that storm water will drain therefrom.
5. All required easements are to be shown on the face of the final plat.
6. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Council action.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

SS-11-68

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Heino that the request for a temporary land use permit for the removal of sand and other materials from the Red Cedar River Basin, be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported on the present status of the proposed Urban Renewal Project No. 3.

Mr. Guernsey discussed the background and the land use within proposed project No. 3.

Mr. Reynolds read a letter from Redevelopment Director Zimmerman regarding the boundaries for proposed project No. 3, and commented that the project does provide for relocation of Diamond Reo with the City.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from David H. Jenkins regarding the South Logan Land Use Policy was read by Mr. Guernsey.

Received and placed on file.

Letter from Robert Boatman regarding the South Logan Land Use Policy was also read by Mr. Guernsey.

Received and placed on file.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Black requested the elimination of retyping the staff recommendation in the staff report. Also that the Zoning Committee read the subject matter and their recommendation unless the reading of their whole report is specifically requested. Mr. Guernsey commented that in the future the Staff will follow this procedure.

Mr. Gaus asked that the name of the petitioner in each zoning matter be included in the Staff Report write ups.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

N/M

of the board, on a designated depository bank, and signed by any two (2) of the following: The director of city utilities-GENERAL MANAGER OR THE ASSISTANT GENERAL MANAGER AND the COMPTROLLER-secretary of the board, OR THE ASSISTANT COMPTROLLER-SECRETARY OF THE BOARD, [and the office manager of the board,] provided, however, that payments by check shall be limited to payment of payroll, payment of pensions, and payment of customer security deposit refunds.

Section 2. All ordinances or parts of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Mr. David Welton, 4810 Ora St., spoke relative to opinion of Judge Fox on the Jolly-Cedar Turnkey Project.

John Lillis, 3220 Karen, spoke and presented petitions relative sidewalk on Jolly Rd. from Connors to Wexford and on the east side of Wexford from Jolly Rd. to the school. Also reduce speed limit from 45 mph to 25 mph.

Also speaking Margaret Lewis, 3220 Karen, Ed. Herndon, 3131 Karen, and Margaret Lillis.

Referred to Department of Public Service and Traffic Department.

David Hugger, 1527 Downey, spoke relative to house next to him being leased by the City is in bad condition, also cars parked in front yard.

Referred to Department of Public Service, Housing Department, Building Department and Police Department.

Professor Gary Reynolds, 1632 Alpha, spoke relative to Jolly-Cedar project.

Floyd Decker spoke.

Cullen Dubois spoke.

Council adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

November 18, 1968

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 6, 1968

The meeting was called to order at 7:40 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Duncan and Fink—2.

HEARINGS

P-7-68 Bardaville Plaza, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Main, of the Planning Staff, discussed the location, present zoning, land use in the area and proposal as submitted by the developer for the subject property.

Developer was not present.

Mr. Black questioned if this property is the same site that the Planning Board objected to for public housing use. Is there any difference in the proposal submitted?

Mr. Main stated that the matter before the Board is not for zoning. The proposal is a plat which as submitted consists of six lots of varying size which would be accessible from a public street running north and south from Grand River with an outlet to the east property line. The present zoning on the site is "F" Commercial, "D-1" Professional and "D-M" Multiple.

No one spoke in objection.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

SS-15-68

Amendment to the Zoning Code regarding housing for the elderly. Mr. Guernsey discussed the proposed amendment, stating that under the present code, elderly housing is permitted subject to the same density standards as conventional apartments and is at a disadvantage because the density in terms of persons is more restrictive in terms of persons per acre permitted. It is recommended therefore that the D-M and D Districts be amended to include a section on "Uses Subject to Special Conditions" using the standards set out in the proposed Vilcan Leman Code.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-22-68

Amendment to the Zoning Code to provide regulations and requirements for walls and fences. It is believed screening requirements are desirable and do protect private property rights. Such regulations are proposed in the Vilcan Leman proposed code, however since the enactment of this code is some time in the future, it is proposed this amendment be established at this time.

It is recommended that Section 36-54 of the Code, namely "Exception to height and area regulations" be amended to read "Exceptions to height and area regulations and provisions for fences and walls."

Mr. Al Boyd, representing Greater Lansing Chamber of Commerce, Edward Ellsworth, Motor Wheel, and James Walkinshaw, Oldsmobile Engineering, submitted a statement to the Board regarding this matter.

Received and placed on file.

Mr. Richard Neller, speaking in behalf of the housing industry, stated that walls and fences are in some places necessary, but if this became mandatory there would be fences and walls where they were not really needed. Also the cost of a brick wall or some fences is something for the Planning Board to consider.

Mr. Reynolds questioned if Mr. Neller thought screening should be required as per each specific rezoning and Mr. Neller replied he thought the builder should make the decision.

Mrs. Bradley, 117 W. Jefferson, spoke in support of the proposed amendment.

R. K. Rollis, 3863 Waverly Hills Road, spoke in support.

Mr. Ranger, Willoughby, stated if Willoughby Industrial Park rezoning is approved, that there should be screening provided.

Matter referred to the Ordinance Committee.

SS-25-68

Amendment to the Zoning Code with regard to setbacks. It is recommended that a provision be added that the setback be established by the average of the abutting parcels in the event they are undeveloped, the setback would be that required by the single family district.

No one spoke in regard to the proposed amendment.

Matter was referred to the Ordinance Committee.

Z-71-68

Michael Stafford, attorney, spoke in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5600 S. Logan Street from A-1 Residential to E-2 Drive-In. He stated that the property in question is triangular in shape and ideally situated for a service station, as proposed by this petition. He pointed out that S. Logan Street is a major highway and that this particular area is not suited for residential development. The proposed use would not adversely affect surrounding property. He described the surrounding land use.

Mr. Fink arrived at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. Stafford submitted photos of the subject property to illustrate heavy tree coverage to the rear of this property which would screen it from residential development.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 8:20 p.m.

Mr. Black questioned the status of this property in light of the recently recommended South Logan Street Zoning Policy.

Mr. Heino replied it is recommended as area which could be developed as D-M:1 type density development.

No one spoke in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-72-68

Mr. William Austin, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3214 N. East Street from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial. He stated the peti-

tioner wishes to expand the rear of the existing building, $4\frac{1}{2}$ feet to be exact, which would leave 47 feet of parking in the rear.

Mr. Eberle, the petitioner, was present.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that the City Council has requested the Planning Board to study the North East Street Area.

No one spoke in objection.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-73-68

Mr. Grammatico, petitioner, appeared in behalf of his petition to rezone property at 1017 Reo Road from A-1 Family to D-M:1 Multiple. Mr. Grammatico said the property contains approximately 73,000 square feet and the D-M:1 zoning requested would permit about 24 units. He described the surrounding land use. The owner of the single family dwelling on the site was present, and questioned the meaning of D-M:1 Multiple development. Mr. Guernsey explained that it is low density multiple family zoning.

Sophie Pavlik, 945 Reo Road, asked that since their property would be in the middle of multiple development, could their property also be rezoned D-M:1.

Mr. Fink suggested the Staff consider the land north of Vincent Court for multiple zoning.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-74-68

Petitioner not present in regard to petition to rezone property at 3711 Sandhurst Street from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-75-68

Mr. Abood, attorney, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 3900 block of S. Logan Street from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional. Mr. Abood requested that this petition be adjourned.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that this petition be tabled for 30 days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-76-68

Mr. Russell Lawler, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1112 Rose Court from "J" Parking to

D-M Multiple. He introduced Dr. Donald Westin, Acting Director of Mental Health, Sister Barbara Marie, in charge of Mental Health, Sister Mary Janice, the hospital administrator, and Mr. Frank Montague, Assistant Administrator of Mental Health, who were present in behalf of this petition.

Mr. Lawler described the background of the subject property. A halfway house for mental patients is proposed for the site. It will be a part of the hospital facility. Four to five patients with a housekeeper would be the occupants. He described the existing land use in the vicinity.

Dr. Westin discussed this new approach in handling mental patients and the need for this kind of care.

Fred Barberio, 915 Westmoreland, property owner to the west of subject property, spoke in objection but thought if rezoning was approved that the exit from the hospital parking should be routed to another street.

Discussion followed.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-77-68

Mr. Richard Neller appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 6326 S. Cedar Street from A-1 Family to "F" Commercial, "E" Apartment-Shop, and D-M Multiple Districts.

Mr. Neller described which pieces of land were designated for each proposed use.

Mr. Hino discussed the proposed Edgewood Boulevard extension in relation to the existing Community. The proposed street pattern was also discussed.

Mrs. Robert Yager, 400 E. Miller Road, questioned the D-M proposed and if any exits were proposed onto Miller Road.

Mrs. C. Linderman also questioned exits from proposed development.

The effect of the proposed development on the valuation of the single family homes was questioned.

Mrs. G. Patrick, 6529 Rosedale Road, asked what would be done at the end of Rosedale Road.

Rex Teters, 420 E. Miller Road, spoke in objection to D-M Multiple behind the single family homes.

Arthur Jackson, 6264 Gardenia, asked if Gardenia has to be widened, who assumes the costs? Mr. Guernsey replied that the abutting property owners would be assessed a share of the costs.

Mrs. Linderman stated the residents in the area preferred their country atmosphere, did not like project crowding their homes. Why not one family dwellings?

Walter Neller discussed multiple family development in relation to single family neighborhoods. Thought the proposed development would be beneficial to existing community.

Beverly Teters, 420 E. Miller Road, questioned density of proposed D-M.

Mrs. Bradley, 117 W. Oakland, questioned if she could build single family home on property she owns in subject area.

Approximately 25 persons present in regard to this matter.

Matter referred to Zoning Committee.

Re: Z-68-68

Mr. Dale Jones, Safety Council of Greater Lansing, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 1017 East Kalamazoo Street from A-1 to D-1 Professional, and stated this proposed rezoning would be beneficial. Better service would be provided. Described existing land use in the area.

Recess from 9:40 to 10:10 p.m.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-49-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Tedd T. White to rezone property at 3109 West Miller Road from A-1 Family to D-M:1 District be denied.

The site under consideration is one of several large tracts of land in the area, which were divided prior to annexation to the City of Lansing. The land prior to annexation was used primarily for farming and has remained vacant due to the lack of public utilities and facilities.

Public Service has indicated that sanitary sewer that will serve this site will be available within one year, with storm sewer to follow later. In either case sewers are not being designed to handle a large concentration of multi-family development. Therefore the City should take a firm position at this time regarding the land use for this area.

The proposed change (when considering the basic land use) would create an isolated district unrelated to the area. This could also foster uncontrolled development throughout the area, and deter the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations. This is especially true in the case of the property directly to the south, which does not have frontage on a public street.

Development of this area should be considered on the basis of an overall plan. One which takes into consideration existing and proposed land use relationships.

Platting of the land which would insure necessary street widening, new streets, and reservations for the usual public utilities and facilities, should accompany any development for this area.

The applicant states that this zoning change would allow the highest and best use of the property. The courts have held that the highest and best use is "No Weighty Factor" in zoning. If it were the whole concept of uniform zoning by districts—to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the municipality would have to fall.

Barone v. Township of Bridgewater, Supreme Court of New Jersey, July 6, 1965.

The applicant states that the proximity of the new highway (I-96) has made this property unsuitable for single family use.

This philosophy is hardly applicable when considering that the proposed change would expose more people to the (assumed) adverse affects of the freeway.

Based on the fact that sewer facilities are not immediately available, and development plans for the subject property and vicinity have not been given consideration. In view of these facts the Board believes that the proposed change is premature. This is also true when relating the proposal to community needs. Present indications are that the apartment market is saturated.

It is further pointed out that this property (in relation to community development) has a rural setting, and to encourage any major development in the vicinity would further delay growth in the urbanized areas.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-60-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Dr. Robert D. Wirt to rezone property at north of 4909 South Logan—100 feet of frontage from A-1 Residential to D-1 Professional District be denied as filed and that the east 10 ft. of the property be rezoned from A-1 Family to "J" Parking and the balance of the property be rezoned from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional. Zoning change provides a relocation, and an upgrading of a present professional use, within the general area. Screening to be provided along the east property line.

The site under consideration and the adjacent properties are only partially developed, and as a result of previous platting of the property to the east there is no

access to the property other than Logan Street. It is also pointed out that the Gilkey Drain extends through this area with a 100-foot easement, which consumes a substantial amount of the buildable area.

The Logan Street Plan proposes this area for multi-family development, with the drain easement set aside for both active and passive recreation. The basic reason for this proposal was to discourage further strip commercial zoning along Logan Street and to provide a proper transitional use adjacent to the existing single family development.

The question now becomes one of judgment, relating to a specific type of use.

Office use is generally considered as a reasonable transition between unrelated uses. In this case a major arterial and single family development.

The Board believes the proposed change would be in keeping with general intent of the Logan Street Zoning Policy in the sense that the change would not introduce any type of development that would be adversely affecting the adjacent properties. The site has ease of access to a major arterial, and the existing development prohibits any possibilities of an increase of traffic and activity on the interior residential streets.

The structural height limitations in the D-1 Office District are the same as the multi-family zone, therefore any proposal in this respect would be in keeping with the Policy Plan.

Uses allowed in the D-1 Office District are not the type that produce obnoxious conditions such as: noise, dust, odors, etc., and in most cases the activities are limited to daylight hours, therefore the change of continuous activities are limited. It may therefore be said that in this situation on the intensity of land use that would result from a professional office is no greater than would result from apartments. This situation would not however always hold true and generally indiscriminate mixing of offices and apartments are not recommended.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-63-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert June, M.D., to rezone property at 818 Center Street from C-2 Family to F-1 Commercial be denied.

The property in question is located within an area that is subject to considerable controversy as to the ultimate and desirable land use development.

First of all the Master Plan indicates this area as Industrial, but this discussion was based on an entirely different Land Use Development Program for the Central City.

Recent studies of this area which includes Cedar, Larch Corridor Study, Urban Renewal No. 2, and the Model Cities Program, have indicated the desirability, and need to take a second look at the area.

The Planning Department's Long Range Division has reviewed the application in relation to the above mentioned studies, and recommend denial for the following reasons:

1. The site location is on a very heavily traveled major arterial. Although traffic projections from Tri-County are not yet available it is anticipated that the street will operate at its design capacity within the next 2-3 years.

The proposed use could result in an additional conflict point, if access was available to Oakland Avenue. Excessive traffic volumes hinder commercial activity.

2. The Community Renewal Program indicates that this area will become a re-development project in the future.
3. The area is within the Model Cities program and is indicated for residential re-use in the Cedar-Larch Corridor Study.
4. A Master Plan revision of the entire area will be completed this year—premature zoning could establish an undesirable development pattern without the benefits of an overall plan.
5. The established uses on the east side of Center Street are residential. The rezoning in effect would constitute a spot zone.
6. Residential neighborhoods regardless of the environment or the income groups residing within should receive equal protection of the law.
7. The housing supply in the value range of the homes along Center Street are in short supply. Each year scattered rezonings in older neighborhoods remove 150-300 units of this value from the housing market. Unless adequate housing in this income range is available we are only compounding a difficult problem which will lead to more expensive public involvement in the future.

Additional testimony submitted by Mr. Gerald B. Bump of 816 Center Street indicates some of the undesirable aspects of indiscriminate zoning, and points out physical features that should be given consideration regardless of the potential development of the area.

The Board would like to further emphasize that along with the site being inadequate in size for commercial development, or as a matter of fact, too small for most

any type of development, the change would allow encroachment of adverse influences into the existing residential area, and possibly affect property values if development of adjacent areas are held in accord with existing regulations. Lastly and perhaps most important this type of rezoning would constitute spot zoning which has been struck down by the highest courts in the country on innumerable occasions.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-64-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Bank of Lansing to rezone property at 216-221 N. Clipper be denied as filed and that the property described as:

The west 25 feet of Lots 79, 80, and 81; all of Lot 61; the south 4 feet and the west 20 feet of Lot 50; the west 20 feet of Lots 47, 48 and 49; and also the east 9.45 feet of the vacated alley lying west of and adjacent to Lots 47, 48, 49, 50 and 51, all in Alamo Heights Subdivision

be rezoned from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial subject to the provision of off-street parking at a rate of one space for each 1500 square feet of useable floor space within the bank.

The existing zoning pattern is a combination of "F" Commercial and "J" Parking Districts which are arranged in a manner which reflects a previous land ownership pattern. The bank has assembled several properties and consequently the zoning districts must be rearranged to accommodate the proposed site design.

The site plan as submitted has a good interior circulation pattern and more than sufficient off-street parking has been provided.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-65-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend that the petition to rezone property at 1009 Pierce Road from A-1 Family to "F" Commercial be denied.

It was brought to the Board's attention that the petitioner, Donald J. Dunn, had requested by letter that this petition be postponed until September.

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that this petition be tabled 30 days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-66-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Wm. F. Jipson to rezone property at 3106 N. East Street from A-1 Residential to "F" Commercial be denied as filed and that the east 35 feet of Lots 1 and 2 be rezoned from A-1 Family to "J" Parking and the balance of the property be rezoned "F" Commercial. Screening consisting of a six-foot high chain link fence with interwoven redwood slats be provided along the west line of the "J" Parking District.

Most of this area was developed prior to annexation and consequently without the benefit of reasonable land use or siting controls. The lot immediately north of the subject property is an example of the kind of development which characterizes the area. It measures 43 by 113 and is occupied by a commercial building and a single family home.

The problems posed by the mixed land uses and commercial nature of the area lying east of North East Street can only be solved by public renewal activity and our present priorities preclude the use of scarce funds in this area.

With this in mind and cognizance of recent rezonings to the north and south of the subject property seem to indicate that this property should also be rezoned provided however that steps are taken to protect the adjacent residential areas.

It would appear that the existing district boundaries are illogically drawn in relation to the existing conditions and further that the change of zoning will not adversely affect adjacent properties if proper screening is provided.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-67-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Myra Lou Shapiro to rezone property at 117 Ferguson Street from C-2 Family to "J" Parking be granted subject to screening being provided along the north and east property lines (except at points of ingress and egress).

The site under consideration will be used to facilitate the improvement of the property to the south, where the applicant pro-

poses to construct a medical building. The area falls within the established commercial development along East Michigan Avenue and is so designated on the Master Land Use Plan. This is not to say strip commercial is desirable but the development is in existence, and it is now the responsibility of the local government to improve the situation any way possible.

The Board is of the opinion that this change will help alleviate the problem of on-street parking in the adjacent residential areas, and lessen traffic congestion along Michigan Avenue. Any adverse characteristics of the proposed use of the land can be substantially reduced by the developer providing proper screening, landscaping, and lighting.

It is further pointed out that this area is in a state of transition, and is indicated as a major rehabilitation area according to the Community Renewal survey. The request would in effect encourage implementation of this treatment.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-68-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Safety Council of Greater Lansing to rezone the property at 1017 E. Kalamazoo Street from C-2 Family District to D-1 Professional Office or Special Use District be denied.

The site under consideration is located approximately 150 feet east of Pennsylvania Avenue on the north side of Kalamazoo Street. Other than the development of three service stations at the intersection, this area has experienced very little change regarding land use. The existing development has retained its residential stability despite the fact that it is exposed to high volumes of traffic.

The Community Renewal survey indicates minor rehabilitation for a high percentage of development in the immediate area with major rehabilitation and redevelopment for those areas exposed to the adverse influences of commercial development. This in itself should be sufficient evidence for discouraging an intermixture of unrelated uses.

The adverse affects of zoning as requested are very gradual and only over a period of time can the detrimental affects be measured, property values are affected, conversions of buildings unsuited for their new use are quite common, and two of the most visual affects are the inadequate screening of adjacent properties, and the impact on traffic flow. These are just a few of the

detrimental affects of indiscriminate zoning and land use development along major streets. We point out the existing condition along North East Street or South Cedar Street, which without a doubt had their beginning in much the same manner. The Board would further point out that there are other areas in the City which will accommodate the proposed use without threatening the stability of an established neighborhood. Lastly and perhaps most important, this type of rezoning would constitute spot zoning which has been struck down by the highest courts in the country on innumerable occasions.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-69-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by William P. Nakfor to rezone property at 920 Center Street from C-2 Family District to D-M:1 Multiple Family District be approved.

The site under consideration is located within the area known as the Model Cities neighborhood. Analysis of this area has been completed and submitted to the Federal Government for approval, for which Lansing may receive Federal monies to carry out detailed studies, and eventually redevelopment of the area.

Subsequent studies regarding existing and future development of this area have been considered by the Planning Board and looked favorable upon, these are included in the Cedar-Larch Corridor Study. The suggestions and recommendations contained within this report indicate that it would be desirable to hold the area under consideration for residential development. The results of these studies are contrary to the Master Plan which indicated the entire Cedar-Larch Corridor for industrial expansion. The Master Plan was developed prior to many of the existing and proposed projects for this area, and therefore may be just cause for amending said plan.

In any event the Board does not believe the proposed zoning change will provide much needed housing comparable to market demands.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-70-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan, that the petition to rezone property at

1601 E. Willoughby from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial be tabled 30 days pending further study.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

Z-121-67

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the request for rezoning located in the 2300 and 2400 blocks of East Jolly Road from A-1 Residential to Community Unit Plan be denied. The Board believes that there has been ample time for developers to prepare plans reflecting the Planning Board's recommendation or at least express their intent to proceed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Z-2-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the petition by Urban American Land Development Company to develop a tract of land in the 5900 block of South Washington Avenue from A-1 Family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

Mr. Fink questioned if there had been any communication with the developer which would indicate his intent in this matter. Mr. Heino informed him that the developer was questioned on several occasions regarding the development of this land to which there was no response. It is assumed he has lost interest.

Mr. Duncan stated that inasmuch as Z-2-68 is an effort to provide housing for the community, he would move that this matter be tabled for thirty days and that the developer be informed that action would be taken on this matter at that time.

Supported by Fink.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-8-68

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Fink, that the petition to rezone property at the 3200-3300 blocks of North Larch from A-1 Family to Community Unit Plan be tabled for a period of thirty days and that the developer be informed that action would be taken on this matter at that time.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-45-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to City

Council that the petition by Larry D. Fowler to rezone property at the southeast corner of Miller and Grovenburg Roads from A-1 Family to Community Unit Plan be denied as filed and that the property be rezoned from A-1 Family to C-2 Family District.

The Board believes that this change will allow reasonable use of the land, and will promote development compatible with development in the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Mr. Fink suggested that a time limit be set regarding communication with petitioners after the Board's initial recommendation, and that this limit be included in the recommendation letter.

Mr. Guernsey suggested this matter be added as part of the Board's Rules of Procedures. Further discussion to occur on this matter.

The Planning staff submitted to the Board a list of zoning changes for their consideration. Two of the changes have been precipitated by zoning and land use policies adopted by the Planning Board, and two due to the fact that they allow development of character with existing development in the area in which they are located. They are as follows: 4700 S. Logan; 4806 S. Logan; 1414, 1418, 1422, 1428 E. Grand River and 1102 Clark Street; and 604-612 and 526 West Willow Street.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the staff be authorized to initiate zoning changes on the preceding described properties and that public hearing on same be set for August 20, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

The Planning staff then submitted a group of properties north of Michigan Avenue within the boundaries of the Central City Development Plan. These properties vary in size and in many cases are substandard in size according to existing standards. Zoning and land use development within this area is mixed residential and office uses. In several areas the existing zoning and land use development is contrary to the Central City Development Plan.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the staff be authorized to initiate zoning changes to conform with the Central City Development Plan on the described proper-

ties and that hearings on same be scattered throughout September.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-8-68F Beaujardin Subdivision, Final Plat

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that this matter be tabled until August 20, 1968, pending the report of the Department of Public Service.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

SS-30-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the following resolution be adopted by the Board:

Whereas, the Planning Board in its consideration of various development proposals in the area bounded by Miller Road, S. Cedar Street, I-96 and S. Logan Street has detected the need for an additional transportation facility paralleling the I-96 expressway, and

Whereas, the Major Street Plan did not provide for said facility, and

Whereas, it is necessary that said Major Street Plan reflect the need for said facility in order that lands lying within the path of said route may be reserved for acquisition,

Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Planning Department is hereby directed to prepare a Master Plan amendment to include the proposed Edgewood Boulevard from Miller Road southerly and easterly to Cedar Street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

Mr. Fink excused himself from the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

SS-11-68

Motion by Blackall, seconded by Heino, that the request of Mr. W. C. Wright for a temporary land use permit for the removal of sand and other materials in the Red Cedar Basin as provided for by Section 36-52 of the Code of Lansing be denied.

The area of consideration contains approximately 90 acres and is located north of Mt. Hope and generally east of the proposed Aurelius Road extension and the Red Cedar River, south of the C&O Railroad

right-of-way. The area is presently undeveloped and in its natural state within the flood plain of the Red Cedar River.

The Planning Board recommends that this request be denied as it is not in the best interest of the community and would be a violation of the Flood Plain Ordinance adopted by City Council. The analysis of the Planning Board as contained in its report of August 6, 1968, explains in detail the position of the Board.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—7.

Nays: None.

Mr. Blackall excused himself from the meeting at 11:45 p.m.

URBAN RENEWAL AND HOUSING

Mr. Kubanek presented the Urban Renewal District areas for Projects 1, 2, and 3. Discussion occurred on the progress of Urban Renewal Project No. 2.

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board concur with the boundaries as presented, which were designated to comply with Act 344, Public Acts of 1945 as amended by Act 189.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

ORDINANCE

SS-27-64

The Board was advised that the Mapped Improvements Ordinance was originally recommended to the City Council in late 1964. Recently the City Council's Committee on Ordinances and Contracts expressed an interest in the Ordinance which in turn prompted a review of the original Ordinance by the staff and committee.

The revised Ordinance has a slightly different emphasis in that it may be thought of as an enabling ordinance which will establish the procedural framework within which precise maps of certain portions of the Master Plan can be drawn and adopted, after public hearing, by the City Council. The original ordinance attempted to establish the procedure and also adopt some precise maps all in the same step. It is believed that this approach was probably overly complex, that is, the idea of map reservation should have been dealt with as a separate issue. The revised Mapped Improvements Plan attempts to do this.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the following resolution be forwarded to the City Council:

Whereas, the Planning Board is cognizant of need, in certain instances, to

reserve certain lands for future public use, and

Whereas, Act 222, Public Acts of 1943, provides the legal basis for the reservation of land after public hearing and recommendation of the Planning Board, and

Whereas, the attached, recommended Ordinance has been drawn to comply with Act 222 and establishes the procedural framework within which land may be reserved for future public use,

Now, Therefore Be It Resolved, that the attached draft of the Mapped Improvements Ordinance is hereby recommended to the City Council who are hereby encouraged to adopt said Ordinance.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

NEW BUSINESS

SS-24-67

Shopping Center Report No. 6 has been distributed to the Board and will be brought forth for discussion at a later date.

A letter from the Community Services Council regarding a Planning Board delegate was read by Mr. Guernsey. Mr. Fink is to remain as a delegate and Director is to appoint an appropriate staff member also as a delegate.

Meeting adjourned at 12:05 a.m.

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSING COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 29, 1968

The October 29th meeting of the Lansing Housing Commission was called to order by President Owen.

ROLL CALL

Present—Commissioners Clapp, Hagerty, Owen, Sliker—4.

Absent—Commissioner Patterson—1.

The minutes of the previous meeting were corrected and approved as corrected.

CORRESPONDENCE

1. Letter from the Housing Assistance Office in Chicago regarding approval of land prices for the downtown elderly high-rise.

2. Letter from the Lansing School District regarding using a unit at the LaRoy Froh Project for a Head Start Program. A suggestion was made that the Fire Marshal be asked to check the unit to verify that it meets the fire regulations for the intended usage.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS

1. Report on a meeting of Comprehensive Services at the LaRoy Froh Project. An assistant to the Service Coordinator at the project is now in training.

2. The Service Coordinator is concerned about the need for a Day Care facility at the project.

3. Report given of the continuing efforts to write procedures to cover the activities of the office. These procedures will eventually be brought to the Commission for review and possible adoption as policies.

4. Regulations and Procedures for acceptance of units have been written and sent to turnkey developers.

5. Mayor Pro-tem of the Council has asked the Commission for documentation of the reasons for the rejection of the Capitol Apartments.

PROJECT REPORTS

1. Mich. 58-1 (Leased Housing)—88 units now under lease.

claim of appeal and to order a transcript of said proceeding to review same and to advise this Council of any reversible error in said transcript if any, for purposes of perfecting said appeal, in the decision in the case of Rangel vs. City of Lansing to the United States Court of Appeals in Cincinnati.

The vote on the amendment was as follows:

Yeas: Councilmen Adado, Anas, May, Perrin, Smith—5.

Nays: Councilmen Belen, Ferguson, Moore—3.

The vote on the resolution as amended was as follows:

Yeas: Councilmen Adado, Anas, May, Perrin, Smith—5.

Nays: Councilmen Belen, Ferguson, Moore—3.

Councilman Perrin presented a letter from Pennway Church of God asking permission to have live Nativity Pageant on the west lawn of their church property at 4207 Alpha Street, December 21 through 24, 1968.

By Councilman Perrin—

That permission be granted.

Carried.

Councilman Smith spoke about the speed limits on Oakland and Saginaw Streets in the vicinity of the Hospital, Holy Cross school and Verlinden school being 30 MPH; also the necessity of pedestrian overpasses in these areas.

Mr. James Dunn, 731 Verlinden Ave., spoke relative meeting in Mr. Hayes' office about the traffic conditions on Oakland Ave. and Saginaw St. and also relative to pedestrian overpasses in these areas.

The following persons spoke:

Kenneth Smith, 524 Edison Ave.

Jerry Reynolds, 1632 Alpha St.

Eugene Lloyd, 1312 Case St.

Dwayne Allen, 300 Syringa Dr.

Mrs. Parrish, 4615 Stafford.

Council adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

December 2, 1968

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, August 20, 1968

August 20, 1968

Z-79-68

6th Floor City Hall

The meeting was called to order at 7:55 P.M. by Vice Chairman Black.

Mr. Jon Bondarenko appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4600 block of South Logan Street from D-1 Professional to D-M Multiple District.

ROLL CALL

Mrs. Bretz arrived at 8:00 P.M.

Present: Black, Duncan, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—5.

Absent: Bretz, Blackall and Heino—3.

Mr. Bondarenko, who is the property owner of the subject property, spoke in

objection to the proposed rezoning by the Board. He asked to have this petition tabled for further study. When the property was zoned D-1 he thought there would be a doctor's office on the premises, which was about three years ago.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-80-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 1414, 1418, 1422, 1428 E. Grand River Avenue and 1102 Clark Street from "H" Light Industrial to C-2 Family.

Property owner at 1414 E. Grand River stated he bought his property for parking for his laundry next door. He wishes the property to remain in its present zoning.

Property owner at 1102 Clark spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-81-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 4806 S. Logan Street from "F" Commercial to D-1 Professional District.

Marvin DeWald, owner of the subject property, questioned the proposed rezoning. He submitted a letter asking that this petition be tabled thirty days.

Motion by Reynolds, seconded by Gaus, that this petition be tabled to September 17, 1968, for further study.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-82-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 604-612 and 526 W. Willow Street from D-M Multiple dwelling to D-M:1 Multiple District.

Mrs. Elmer Manson, owner of property in question, stated it has not been financially possible to develop this property as planned. The proposed D-M:1 zoning would be cutting the density in half which would make it even more difficult. Asked Board's careful consideration before this change is made.

Property owner at 523 W. Willow spoke in regard to the traffic problem on W. Willow and the entrance to Consumers Power, and that he thought the D-M:1 would not have as great a volume of traffic as the D-M.

Property owner at 527 W. Willow questioned the Board's jurisdiction as to when present properties would have to be moved. Also asked about cleaning up the property,

and stated it had been the neighborhood opinion that Consumers Power would use the access off Christopher Street rather than W. Willow.

Mr. Fink stated that the Board and Staff should be concerned about industry in a residential area, that there should be a clarification of the best land use in this area.

Mr. Black stated he was surprised to hear about Consumers Power traffic situation. If they are using Willow Street as access of their heavy trucks, something should be done about this matter also.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that this petition be tabled to allow the Staff to conduct an analysis on the area between Willow Street on the south, Christopher Street on the west, Walnut Street on the east, and the bank of the river on the north. Time limit of not more than sixty days.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Recess 8:55 P.M. to 9:10 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the minutes of June 4, 1968, and June 18, 1968, be approved after the correction of page 8 of the June 18 minutes regarding the motion on the market study which read "motion by Black, seconded by Black."

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

P-9-68F

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that a public hearing be held on September 3, 1968, on the Preliminary Plat of Abood Ramada Subdivision.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

P-8-68F

Beaujardin Subdivision Final Plat

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Final Plat of Beaujardin Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

The posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$11,530.00
Curb and Gutter	15,000.00
Monuments	400.00

Gravel	6,600.00
Storm Sewer	52,650.00
Sanitary Sewer	38,570.00
	\$124,750.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal.

All other standards and requirements of the Michigan State Plat Act, Act 172, Public Act of 1929, as amended shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-10-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Gaus, that the request of Motor Wheel Corporation to vacate a portion of Handy Street be tabled pending a satisfactory agreement as to the relocation and cost of Board of Water and Light utilities, located in the portion of Handy Street requested for vacation.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Misc-28-68

The Board considered Mayor Murningham's announcement at his Cabinet Meeting on August 14, 1968, that in the future the Parks Department and the Public Service Department would collaborate on street projects whenever possible. The utilizing of the talents and abilities of landscape architects to preserve and enhance the beauty of the City will benefit all citizens.

This kind of direct action by City government to bring about a desirable appearance through the preservation of trees and other plantings can be a powerful stimulus for action by all the citizens of the Lansing Community.

Motion by Black, supported by Gaus, that the following resolution be forwarded to City Council:

Therefore be it resolved by the Planning Board of the City of Lansing that Mayor Murningham be officially commended for his efforts to enhance the appearance of the City.

The Planning Board further recommends that the Mayor and City Council indicate at every opportunity that all construction contracts for the City reflect this desire to always improve and beautify the surroundings which are reflected by these construction contracts.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Mr. Fink commented that if the Board is going to be concerned about beautification on a large scale perhaps this should be incorporated in the Subdivision Control Ordinance that the replacement of trees, etc., be included as part of the developer's costs.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that the Staff conduct an analysis on the feasibility of the above suggestion. Time limit of sixty days.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

INDUSTRIAL PARK STANDARDS

Mr. Black discussed the proposed Industrial Park Standards stating that the purpose of the regulations is to give a certain degree of flexibility to Industrial Land Uses by providing the kind of standards which will make industrial uses acceptable in more kinds of urban environments. The standards are designed to insure that industrial developments will maintain a quality of urban environment which will permit the industrial areas to have a greater degree of integration into the Community's residential structure.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Duncan, that the proposed Industrial Park Standards be referred to the Ordinance Committee for report at the mid-month meeting of the Board which would be September 17, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Mr. Reynolds stated that the Board should be careful in making standards for industry so strict that existing industry is driven out of the City or that would prevent new industry from coming to Lansing.

Mr. Fink suggested the proposed standards be considered as an addition to present zoning ordinance rather than waiting until the adoption of the Vilcan Leman Code.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. Duncan remarked that Congress had recently passed a housing legislation bill of 5.2 billion dollars. Because of the scope of legislation and the variety of the kinds of facilities available, it would be germane for the Planning Board members to have a copy of this legislation.

Motion by Duncan, supported by Fink, that the Staff acquire copies of the housing legislation bill for distribution to Planning Board members.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey distributed copies of the Planning Department's Work Program, stating that it is a tentative draft. He noted that all governmental agencies should in the public interest devise methods and structures which will accomplish the most effective work. This work program has been developed with this in mind and with the hope that it will become a step in the use of program budgeting in Lansing. He cited the seven main functions of the Planning Program, those activities specified by Lansing's charter and Michigan law, and the goals, objectives, and procedures of the Planning Board. He asked for the Board members' comments and suggestions regarding the work program. The importance of citizen participation in the planning function was stressed.

Mr. Brown discussed the Work Program Chart, which is one of the monitors of the work program. This Chart records the planning activities, estimated man hours needed to complete each project, and the recorded man hours actually utilized.

Mr. Duncan suggested that the Work Program Chart contain the termination date column for each project.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Nino discussed the Program Evaluation Review Technique stating that the following steps are followed on a project:

1. establish objective; 2. list activities;
3. lay out activities in reasonable sequence;
4. establish estimates; 5 find the critical path. In this way a project is in front of us in such a way that if we have to shorten the project we can do it in a planned sensible way. Deletion of certain activities or extra manpower on the job can be applied since the critical activities are known.

Mr. Black questioned the status of the study on the effect of moving the Capital Building to the west of the Central Business District, which study had previously been requested by the Board. Mr. Guernsey replied that this study is now in progress and would be before the Board shortly.

Mr. Duncan commented that if the PERT approach is developed and the Staff is able to better plan their rationale and position, then the probability is that the plan can be developed and supported by the populace. Dialogue would be established in which courses of action would be clearly explained. People would then have the ability to make decisions based on more knowledge.

Mr. Guernsey stated that if we are to be effective, community support is very important.

Mr. Reynolds thought this technique a step in the right direction.

Progress Report No. 1, North East Street Corridor Land Use Study. This is an attempt to deeply involve citizens in the area in plan making for their community. The Board is being asked to authorize Staff to carry out this project in the manner outlined in Progress Report No. 1. We are at a stage where we are ready to go out into the community and organize citizen committee structure.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Staff be authorized to proceed in the manner described as Program Evaluation Review Technique.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Staff Report regarding the Cedar-Larch Corridor has been forwarded to Planning Board members. Matter referred to Executive Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 3, 1968

6th Floor, City Hall

September 3, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:42 P.M. by
Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Blackall, Black, Reynolds, Fink,
Bretz and Gaus—6.

Absent: Duncan and Heino—2.

HEARINGS

P-9-68

Mr. Fountain of the Planning Department presented the Preliminary Plan of the Abood Ramada Subdivision and described the location and size of the parcel, its proposed land use and present zoning. Ivan Lerner, 1110 E. Miller Road, requested information regarding proposed use of various portions of the proposed development, drainage, assessment, etc. He was informed that at present nothing is planned for the sections in question but it will be in keeping with other businesses in the areas and not be offensive to the homeowners nearby.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-75-68

Mr. Richard J. Abood appeared on behalf of the petitioner, Guy Lowery, to rezone property at 3900 block of S. Logan Street from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional. Mr. Abood distributed a sketch and site development plan to members of the Planning Board for their perusal. Mr. Abood explained the intentions of Dr. Lowery regarding the proposed use of the parcel petitioned for rezoning. Mr. Black questioned if Dr. Lowery owns the property or has an option to buy in the event the property is rezoned. Mr. Abood stated that Dr. Lowery is presently purchasing the property (property owner). Mr. Gaus questioned the intentions for the acreage of the single family residence behind the property. Mr. Wayne Lowery, son of Dr. Guy Lowery, replied that the single family residence behind,

belongs to Ann Burnett and she is the person from whom he and his father had purchased the property proposed for rezoning. He also stated that in the agreement of purchase there were provisions made regarding the screening between the single family residence of Ann Burnett and the property proposed for rezoning. Dr. Lowery stated a need for a facility for Osteopathic doctors. Mr. Guernsey stated that 2 years ago this same parcel of land was proposed for rezoning, and at that time it was denied and that it was the policy of the City at that time that the property be used for multi-family development.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 7:58 P.M.

Z-78-68

Mr. Raymond Auvenshine appeared for the petitioner, the Immanuel Baptist Church, to rezone property at 4301, 4303 and 4305 South Logan Street and 1000 and 1008 Pierce Road from A-1 Family to B-1 Family.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Z-83-68

Petitioner did not appear on behalf of the petition by Edward W. Sparrow Hospital Association to rezone property at 227 and 231 N. Holmes Street from C-2 Family to "J" Parking.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Z-84-68

Petitioner did not appear on behalf of the petition by Granger Associates, Incorporated, to rezone property at 5300 block

S. Cedar Street from "D-M" Multiple to "F" Commercial.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Z-85-68

A Public Hearing was set for October 1, 1968, for the petition by the Plymouth Land Company to rezone property in the 2000 block of W. Miller Road from A-1 Family to Community Unit Plan.

Z-86-68

Mr. Kenneth Brown spoke on behalf of his petition to rezone property at 919, 921, 933 and 935 Reo Road from A-1 Family to C-2 Family. There was discussion regarding the possibility of this petition setting a precedent in the neighborhood.

No one spoke in objection.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Z-87-68

Robert C. Dyer spoke on behalf of his petition to rezone property at 2900 Seventh Avenue from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial. There was a discussion regarding the storage of equipment outdoors, screening and the rundown condition of the area proposed for rezoning. Mr. A. Z. Brown, 805 Bates Street, and Mr. Frank Stafan, 800 Bates Street, questioned the proposed land use if rezoned as proposed. Mr. Guernsey stated the various allowable uses and that no obnoxious use would be permitted. Mr. George Cutler, Harrison 7, spoke in objection. It was brought out that there will be a Public Hearing on the North East Street Study on September 24, 1968, and recommended that all persons interested attend.

Referred to Zoning Committee.

Recess.

Z-65-68

A letter from Mr. Donald J. Dunn was read wherein he requested that the Board's recommendation be postponed 30 days. Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Mr. D. J. Dunn, to rezone a parcel at 1009 Pierce Road from A-1 Family to "F" Commercial be denied.

The Board's reasons for such action may be summarized as follows:

- (1) The Board is deeply concerned with the elimination of strip commercial de-

velopment and in this respect have adopted a policy guiding future actions on South Logan Street. The use in question while recognized should not be enlarged on the basis of the stated adopted policy.

- (2) On a purely physical land use relationship basis the Board is of the opinion that the proposed enlargement of this use would adversely affect the residential area on Pierce Road.
- (3) The rezoning, if granted, would further box-in a residential area fronting on South Logan Street, the result of which would create pressures for additional zoning which would run counter to the South Logan Street Policy Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-70-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by R. N. Kleppe to rezone property located at 1601 E. Willoughby Road from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial be denied as filed and recommends as follows:

The Board is of the opinion that the lands in question would be suitable for industrial type developments if certain standards were employed to overcome any objectionable features of industrial development due to the proximity of this area to existing and future residential areas in the City and Township. These standards are those which have been recommended to you for inclusion in the Code as a new Planned Industrial Category. These standards together with a subdivision design which requires lots backing on to Willoughby Road and access limited to South Cedar Street via Brookdale and Benton Streets would in our opinion overcome any potential objection.

We approached this matter in two ways, one, final rezoning should be delayed pending the completion of platting and the institution of private restrictions which restrictions would be those recommended herein in the event Council does not see fit to institute a third industrial zoning category, or secondly, the Council could proceed to institute the planned industrial category immediately and rezone the land in question to this new category. The second route is preferable and private deed restrictions are far more complicated and beyond the ability of the City to control. In either event we do not recommend rezoning the land to the existing "H" Light Industrial zone.

A number of residents along Kingdon Road expressed concern and opposition to this zoning. Several expressed satisfaction if adequate standards would be imposed.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Reynolds, that the Board further recommend the adoption of the institution of a new industrial category and regulations pertinent thereto as an amendment to the existing Zoning Code.

The Planning Board after some considerable review are of the opinion that such provisions will make it possible to develop industrial areas in such locations as may have theretofore not been considered. Through the vehicle of standards of performance any industrial use is permitted which can satisfy the standards set out for this type of district. At the same time we are of the opinion that certain prestige conscious industries are interested in this kind of zone as it offers them protection which they otherwise would not enjoy.

We would emphasize that this will not in any way affect existing light and heavy industrial districts nor our ability to create new light and heavy industrial districts. This recommendation, if adopted, would create a third type of zoning district.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-71-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Pentecost Development Company to rezone property at 5600 S. Logan Street from A-1 Family Residential to E-2 Drive-In District be denied.

A City's Zoning Ordinance must have some relation to the relative need for market demand for specific land uses. If an ordinance is restrictive and does not provide sufficient areas for housing or industry or barber shops then the Zoning Ordinance can cause severe hardships for the public and aids and abets monopoly power for those fortunate land owners who control the excessively demanded land. On the other hand, if a community overzones for some use, the result is to weaken the market potential of more desirable locations and in the case of service stations to dilute the market to such an extent that existing operations often succumb to the market forces. Zoning then, must tread a thin line between under and over zoning; it must provide enough land to insure competition but still adhere to good planning principles; e.g., in accord with neighborhood demands, and with cognizance of the public health and welfare and etc.

With the above thoughts in mind the Board examined this petition, its relationship to the existing and proposed development in the area and its relation to the South Logan Street Zoning Policy—the results of the examination are as follows:

Field inspection reveals the existence of several gasoline stations near this property. There are three stations between this property and Jolly Road and at least five stations between this property and the I-96 expressway. In addition a ninth site is zoned and awaiting development. This would seem to indicate that sufficient stations are available to serve the market. Giving further credence to this proposition is the existence of at least two other stations which have been converted to some other use.

The Logan Street Policy Plan does not envision commercial uses of any kind at this location, but rather, development of a type which will complement the developing single family residential area located immediately to the east. Most likely this development would be residential in nature at a multiple family density. The existence of several mature shade trees reinforces our belief that this property can and should be developed with residential uses.

The applicant's attorney makes reference to the fact that traffic entering Logan Street from Haag Road have an obstructed view to the south. He further intimates that this is hazardous and further that the construction of a service station will remove the vision obstruction and reduce the traffic hazard. On the surface this argument seems plausible, however, it is basically fallacious. The Logan Street, Haag Road intersection is, in terms of numbers of accidents, unusually safe. Only two accidents have occurred there in the last five years and no accidents at all in the last two and one-half years. The applicant's claim of hazardous conditions are therefore not supported by the facts. Neither does construction of a service station in any way guarantee that the vision will be unobstructed. If parked vehicles or those being serviced don't block the view then the numerous advertising devices which normally characterize service stations where having clear, unobstructed vision is most critical will.

It is our position therefore, that no justification for rezoning this property for service station use has been presented. The Staff and Board has spent a great deal of time studying South Logan Street and have recommended a plan for the development of South Logan. Any deviation from the plan should only be made in cases where it can be shown that conditions have developed which were not anticipated when the plan was drawn.

No concern was expressed by area residents who were notified of this petition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-72-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to the City

Council that the petition by D. M. Eberly to rezone property at 3214 North East Street from "J" Parking to "F" Commercial be granted.

The property was recently zoned to facilitate the construction of a drive-in restaurant immediately south of the service station. That rezoning also had the effect of making the formerly non-conforming service station a conforming use. The site was zoned in its present manner in anticipation of future redevelopment of the service station use.

The present request for an additional ten feet of commercial zoning will facilitate an addition to the rear of the existing station. This change will not appreciably reduce the amount of off-street parking nor will it permit encroachment into the rear yard. The Board has no objection to this amendment.

A property owner to the East of the subject petition expressed concern over screening.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-73-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition to rezone property at 1017 Reo Road from A-1 Family to D:M-1 Multiple Dwelling be tabled 30 days to enable the petitioner to attempt to acquire frontage between Vincent Court and Reo Road as a parcel measuring 147.0 ft. by 165.0 ft. and containing a single family home which is not included in this petition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-74-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Cambridge Development Company to rezone property at 3711 Sandhurst Drive from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional be denied.

The reasons for this recommendation are as follows:

- (1) The lot is part of an approved community unit plan which has been partially developed in a very satisfactory residential environment. Professional offices in this high quality residential environment is totally incompatible.
- (2) In the event this rezoning were granted

we would expect a considerable lowering of the development standards on the remaining undeveloped properties much to the detriment of this area which has progressed very well.

- (3) Such a rezoning would morally betray those who have located in this area on the basis that Waverly Road would be controlled from non-residential uses.
- (4) Such a rezoning may act as a catalyst to further rezoning along Waverly Road which is one street that has so far weathered the tendency to develop in a strip commercial manner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-76-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the petition by St. Lawrence Hospital to rezone property at 1112 Rose Court from "J" Parking to "D" Apartment be granted.

The zoning request under consideration does not meet the basic criteria for Apartment Zoning when related to existing land use development of the area, and the land area involved. However, the purpose for which the property is to be used cannot be ignored. The use proposed will more than likely be temporary, and will provide relief for the hospital facilities.

This type of use is in the public interest and due to the fact that it is located within a medical complex, the change of zoning should not be related to any general residential area.

The size of the subject property, and existing and potential land use development of the area, limits the financial feasibility of a more intense land use development taking place if the property is rezoned.

The existing single family residence adjacent to the west of the subject property cannot be completely ignored, but when taking a total view of the existing and potential land use development, one can safely say that the land use of the area has changed, and that it would be contrary to sound zoning principles, and to encourage the continuation of the residence. Therefore any attempt to consolidate this property with the Hospital Association should be encouraged.

The Board is of the opinion that this change will not adversely affect any adjoining property or the general welfare, and will be in keeping within the general intent of Zoning Controls.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-77-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by the Walter Neller Enterprises, Inc., to rezone property located at 6326 S. Cedar Street to E-M Multiple-Family, E-Apartment-Shop and "F" Commercial be denied.

- (1) There is an oversupply of land now committed to rental housing based upon several economic and market analysis.
- (2) Multiple unit starts and approved plans are in excess of annual estimated rental unit requirements as based upon the foregoing.
- (3) This overzoning will retard the re-use of blighted areas, and areas now sparsely developed and in need of land assembly program.
- (4) In addition to the foregoing this density is unwarranted in a suburban environment.
- (5) Densities should be held to single-family and two-family densities and we should encourage owner occupant housing types which would not preclude condominiums and cooperatives.
- (6) The foregoing can best be achieved by a community unit plan process as only in this manner can we restrict the character and density of the area. We suggest that seven (7) to eight (8) units per acre in the density level necessary to achieve this kind of environment.
- (7) A high density use will adversely affect the abutting residential area and create intolerable levels of traffic upon existing local streets.

The reason for the Board's denial of that part of the petition pertaining to the rezoning to E Apartment-Shop and "F" Commercial are as follows:

- (1) Based upon an analysis which supports low density residential development on continuous lands, said rezoning would create an undesirable and incompatible land use relationship.
- (2) Existing committed commercial zoning to the south of the Edgewood Boulevard extension and the likelihood of additional zoning in this area will provide more land for commercial purposes than can be justified.
- (3) In addition the foregoing market realities the effect of such rezoning of lands north of Edgewood Boulevard would seriously affect the ability of the renewal program.
- (4) Such freedoms granted to the whims of the market place without consideration of the overall public good and welfare, makes any attempt at planning impossible thereby encouraging great economic waste of public services

and facilities while more seriously undercutting Lansing's ability to create and recreate a better City.

- (5) The contiguous existing residential areas will be adversely affected by the high intensive land use.

A number of citizens from the area attended the public hearing in this regard and expressed concern that the development would adversely affect the area.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus and Duncan—5.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Abstain: Blackall—1.

Z-79-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that a change in zoning initiated by the Planning Board for the property located on the northwest corner of Dorchester Circle and Logan Street be rezoned from D-1 Professional to D-M Multiple Dwelling.

The site under consideration was rezoned by action of the City Council in 1965. Development of the property has not occurred, nor has there been indications of any immediate plans to develop. One would assume from this, that the change was speculation on the part of the property owner, and actually resulted in premature zoning.

- (1) This area has experienced several changes in zoning and land use since the initial change of zoning on the subject property. The properties on Dorchester Circle have been developed with apartments. The property immediately to the north was zoned for Multi-Family use, and the property east of Logan Street is presently being developed with townhouses.
- (2) The Board further considered the more recent changes of Commercial Zoning to the south, which were rezoned to accommodate the expansion of neighborhood facilities, and it was the consensus of opinion that there was a substantial amount of land zoned in the area which meets the basic criteria for commercial development.
- (3) The most recent planning for the area has been the adoption of the Logan Street Zoning and Land Use by the Planning Board. This Plan, if implemented, would discourage an intermixture of non-related uses, and provide for a proper transition between existing and potential development.
- (4) The Board further believes that changes of this nature will strengthen their position regarding similar requests, and actually benefit property

owners who may be in a similar position.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-80-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that a change in zoning initiated by the Planning Board for the properties located at 1414-18-22-28 E. Grand River Avenue and 1102 Clark Street be rezoned from "H" Light Industrial to C-2 Family District.

The properties under consideration were rezoned by action of the City Council in 1945. Development of this land has retained its residential characteristics, and is even more desirable since the extension of Oakland Avenue which removed a substantial amount of traffic from Grand River Avenue.

- (1) This property has been zoned light industrial for a period of 23 years, which is more than ample time for development to occur. Based on this fact it can be assumed that the zoning was initiated on a speculative basis, and was actually premature.
- (2) The Board believes that the continuation of this zoning serves as a threat to the financial investment of adjacent residential properties, and if developed to its maximum intensity it would create a blighting influence in the area.
- (3) A review of the existing Land Use Development of the area will convince one that the existing Light Industrial Zoning is out of character.
- (4) Further emphasis is directed toward previous action by the Planning Board and City Council on requests to change zoning in the area. In each case the agreement was to retain the low density residential characteristics of the area, and hold existing non-residential uses at status-quo.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-2-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request by Robert Gutterman, Urban American Land Development Company, to develop a 10.5 acre tract of land in the 5900 block of South Washing-

ton Avenue from A-1 Family to Community Unit Plan be denied.

The initial petition was filed December 26, 1967. The Planning Board proceeded with the request and held the necessary public hearing on March 5, 1968. On April 16, 1968, the Planning Board recommended revisions to the developer's plan and indicated they would give further consideration if a revised plan were submitted. The developer was notified of the Board's action, and as of this date has not indicated his desire to proceed.

The Board believes there has been ample time for the developer to prepare plans reflecting the Planning Board's recommendation or at least express their intent to proceed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

Z-8-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Robert Gutterman, Urban American Land Development Company, to rezone approximately 3.2 acres in the 3200-3300 blocks of North Larch Street from A-1 Family District to Community Unit Plan be denied.

The initial petition was filed January 9, 1968. The Planning Board proceeded with the request and held the necessary public hearing on March 6, 1968. On April 16, 1968, the Planning Board recommended revisions to the developer's plan and indicated they would give further consideration if a revised plan were submitted. The developer was notified of the Board's action, and of this date has not indicated his desire to proceed.

The Board believes there has been ample time for the developer to prepare plans reflecting the Planning Board's recommendation or at least express their intent to proceed.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-7-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Blackall, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the preliminary Plat of Bardaville Plaza be disapproved and that the City Council support the following action:

The Board is of the opinion that the design of this subdivision does not provide a satisfactory solution to the problem of making possible the most efficient and orderly development of surrounding properties. The redesign as indicated herein will in the opinion of the Board provide a more desirable street system and therefore urban environment. The proposed solution provided by the Planning Board will also in its opinion not adversely affect adjoining properties whereas it contends that the design as proposed by the proprietor will adversely affect adjoining properties.

Pursuant to Act 288, Public Acts of 1967, Section 112, the Planning Board sets forth its requirements for tentative approval.

- (1) The preliminary plat should reflect the street pattern shown on the attached sketch.
- (2) The plat shall indicate thereon a landscape easement along the west, south and east boundary of the plat. Said landscape easement shall be a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet wide.
- (3) Said landscape easement shall be developed with an earth berm to a height of five (5) feet, six (6) inches and planted to the satisfaction of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

SS-33-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that the Tree-planting policy in new subdivisions be tabled for 30 days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

P-10-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that a public hearing for the Preliminary Plat of Kahres Farm Subdivision be set for September 17, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ROW-10-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Blackall, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the vacation of part of Handy Street lying west of a point 150 feet westerly from the westerly line of Case Street be approved in the event that satisfactory arrangements are made with respect to the utilities belonging to the Board of Water and Light.

The street is used primarily as access to Motor Wheel properties lying north and

south of Handy Street and west of the New York Central Railway right-of-way. The vacation would not affect any residential uses in view of the fact that the Motor Wheel Company owned the property on either side of that portion of the street proposed for vacation.

In view of the above it is the opinion of the Planning Board after consultation with other affected departments that the street be vacated. However, because the Board of Water and Light have certain facilities within this right-of-way they have requested that the street be vacated only in the event satisfactory arrangements were made with respect to these utilities. The Planning Board supports this position.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

The recommended Planned Industrial Park was discussed.

BUILDINGS AND PROPERTIES

BP-8-68

Motion by Blackall, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to the Park Board and City Council that they purchase a 6½ acre tract of land located between Lochmoor and sumpter west of Stillwell Avenue, for park purposes, providing a satisfactory price can be negotiated.

The surrounding area is fully developed with single family homes with a large number of children per household. It is the belief of the Planning Board that additional park land is needed to the Churchill Downs, Arrowhead Manor section of the City and if it is not obtained at this time there will be no suitable land available for park purposes in the future.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

BP-9-68

Motion by Blackall, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that a Special Use Permit requested by the Capital Area Economic Opportunity Committee for property located at 101-107 E. Willow Street be granted pursuant to Section 36-24(1) of the Zoning Code.

Therefore the Planning Board recommends to City Council that it approve said request subject to the termination of the

use at a specified date or at the will of City Council. It is important that said uses not be permitted in perpetuity as they are invariably contrary to long range plans.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Blackall and Duncan—7.

Nays: None.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Guernsey distributed a copy of a press release regarding Urban Renewal Project No. 1.

Mr. Reynolds spoke on the progress of Urban Renewal Project No. 1.

FINANCE

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that advance expenses for attendance by two staff members for the Data Processing Conference in St. Louis be authorized.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that a salary increase of \$500.00 be approved for Mr. R. Nino, Planning Department.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Mr. Guernsey stated that he has the analysis of the housing bill available in the event that anyone should want to obtain a copy from the Planning Department on a loan out basis.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the Federal Government changed certain guidelines for Urban Renewal. Instead of working on a

project basis they will go on a Neighborhood Development Program (NDP).

Mr. Guernsey stated that he appointed Mr. Alan Tubbs as Long Range Division Chief and Renewal Coordinator.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A.I.P.—Waldenwoods, September 13, 14.

MSPO—Soo, Michigan, October 9, 10, 11—Board invited to attend.

A.I.P.—Pittsburgh, October 12-15—Mr. E. Brown and R. Nino are authorized to attend. The Board is invited.

OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Reynolds questioned the status of the City Market Report.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the City Market Report Study is nearly completed with one or two exceptions. The University is computing the answers to the questionnaires distributed and the telephone survey. The draft of this is anticipated to be to the Board in another week or two, for formal adoption by the end of the month.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Duncan questioned the feasibility of exploring the ethicality and legality of a different system of property taxation whereby there would be an increased taxation on the property of people who let their property become rundown with a decrease in taxation of the property of people who maintain their property well.

Mr. Guernsey stated that he could request that the City Assessor attend the Planning Board's second monthly meeting to discuss the matter.

Meeting adjourned at 11:35 P.M.

It was moved by Trustee Murningham, supported by Trustee Graves, that the Secretary be instructed to prepare an affidavit stating Kirk Young's, retiree, true age and have it placed on file and presented to the Board at the next regular meeting.

Carried.

The physical examination report for James W. Epps, Parks Department, was received and placed on file showing that he is employable for a one year extension of service.

It was moved by Trustee Graves, supported by Trustee Waidelich, that the application for Regular Age and Service Retirement for Carmaleta Stanley, Assessor Department, be approved and accepted; she having attained the age of 60 on November 18, 1968, with 24 years of service credit. Retirement effective January 1, 1969.

Adopted by the following roll call vote:

Yeas: Bodwin, Graves, Murningham, Waidelich and Wilcox—5.

Nays: None.

It was moved by Trustee Murningham, supported by Trustee Graves, that the Board adopt the following resolution and have a copy of it forwarded to City Council for further action:

By Trustee Murningham—

Whereas, the City of Lansing has several city employees who have retired from, or will retire from the city service, and

Whereas, these employees have devoted their lives to providing public service for the citizens of Lansing,

Whereas, the premium cost of the city carried Group Hospital, Medical and Surgical Insurance is a burden to such employees;

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved by This Employees Retirement System, that beginning January 20, 1969, all City of Lansing retirees be provided with the same benefits that city employees receive under city carried Group Hospital, Medical and Surgical Insurance.

Adopted by the following roll call vote:

Yeas: Bodwin, Graves, Murningham, Waidelich and Wilcox—5.

Nays: None.

Additional money was invested in Investment Company of America under the letter of intent. No other investments were made.

\$5,380,000 fixed income securities on hand.

The Board adjourned.

RAYMOND W. BURGESS,
Secretary,
Employees Retirement System.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Special Meeting, October 29, 1968

October 29, 1968

5th Floor, City Hall

7:30 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—6.

Absent: Heino—.

Meeting called to order at 7:45 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-90-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at the 3400 block Aurelius Road be denied.

There are few uses which are more incompatible with residential areas than a contractor's yard with its attendant noise and activity. The incompatibility of this use with the adjacent residences was well documented at the Planning Board's public hearing at which several property owners voiced their objections. In addition to the obvious incompatibility, this application contains some more ominous overtones.

The size and shape of the property is such that any rezoning which would have the effect of permitting nonresidential use of land will destroy the potential of the entire area for residential development. This fact has been recognized by the Forest View Citizens Advisory Committee who have in the past few months developed a land use plan for the area. The plan as proposed suggests a low density residential development for the subject property.

Disregarding the citizen plan and the adjacent single family homes for the moment, let us examine the merits of this request from another angle. It is possible to evaluate the merits of a given site in terms of relatively standardized criteria. The criteria usually cited for a good industrial site are as follows:

1. Transportation—accessibility by rail, highway, and air facilities. The subject property is located on a major street; however, access to the expressway system is only fair and the site has no rail service.
2. Topography—levelness, freedom from flooding and adverse soil conditions. As mentioned earlier, part of the site is low and part has been excavated making it less useable for many industrial activities.
3. Utilities and Services—ease and economy of serving with utilities and services. The site can be served with the usual utilities.
4. Effect on Surrounding Property—absence of nuisance aspect or prospect of otherwise damaging adjacent property.
5. Location in Overall Plan—suitability with respect for relative need for land for other uses. If one accepts the principle that like uses should be clustered, then the site rates very poor in this category also.
6. Accessibility to Workers—appropriately located as to be readily accessible to workers from residential areas. The site again, because of its poor relation to the expressway system, must be rated poor.

All of this is not to say that the site does not fit the petitioner's needs, the point is that there are other sites which meet the needs of industry much more readily and without penalizing single family home owners.

Mr. Black suggested that the basis for recommendation of denial be read to the petitioner.

Mr. Solomon stated that this was not necessary but requested a copy of the recommendation for denial.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-91-68

Mr. Nino asked that a line be added to the staff recommendation to read "And make available to the site and the proposed industrial areas south of Jolly Road as indicated in the proposed Forest View Master Plan."

A map was shown that indicated the area in question.

It was asked if the City had property in this area that they could trade or has the City talked about buying Mr. Solomon's property

In answer it was stated that the City has a landfill and 120 acres plus 43 or 44 acres directly east of there.

It was questioned if this was a proposal to relocate Mr. Solomon?

Answer: The staff recommendation to the Board is that this is an undesirable use in the area. Staff is saying that Council should take action to buy Mr. Solomon's property and assist him in relocation as in an urban renewal project—if not, the land should be zoned.

Mr. Solomon stated that he has been in his present location 35 years and that it took him that long to get sewers and water. He asked how long it would take if he were to move to the proposed location.

He was informed that it would not be too difficult.

It was also stated that it will be more difficult at this time to get utilities into the east side of Sycamore Creek as it would be a connection from Jolly Road south to handle this area.

Mr. Solomon was informed that he would have to petition for a sewer, and that at present no facilities for sewer or water are available.

It was questioned if the landfill area on Aurelius Road is available for building and for use at this time.

Answer: There are some filled but not recently graded and being covered with sewage sludge so that it would bring a good crop of green grass in case they build a parkway or grassway or other area.

Are you anticipating building over sanitary landfill?

There has been an industrial firm interested in this site as one of the tentative sites and there have been tests made of what it will and will not bear. The kind of industry Mr. Solomon would be involved with could be supported. If you are talking of a big heavy press operation with heavy industrial equipment there is a question of its ability to support it, because of the settling factor in the landfill. Graders, storage and sheds, things of that kind that don't weigh a great deal would be no problem but this is an engineering question which I really could not answer.

Mr. Guernsey stated that a public hearing has been set for November 12, 1968.

This would go before Council in 1 week and possibly we could work out some suitable solution in the meantime.

Mr. Black stated that he doesn't think the petition should be granted and suggested recommending to Council that an effort be made to trade some existing City property adjacent to Aurelius Road for Mr. Solomon's property. He also stated that this area should benefit Mr. Solomon due to the closer proximity to the interchange. It would also be simpler and less expensive to extend the sewer facilities than it would be in the proposed industrial area, and that the City should help with the sewer as part of a deal with Mr. Solomon.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the staff considered, when making its analysis, the philosophy involved when you take a step like this if that you should make the man whole whose land you are acquiring, that it wouldn't be right to just trade land, the capitalization structures that he has on the site must be a factor.

Mr. Black stated that this would be a part of the deal.

Mr. Solomon stated that for his property to be bought at the present day market and for a replacement at present day costs; after him building in the 30's and 40's would be an additional expense.

It was stated that a denial does not mean that a rezoning petition could not again be submitted at a later date with a specific site plan which might enhance the value of the property and enable him to function in a more equitable manner from the standpoint of the neighborhood. The Planning Board does not encourage the continuing of a non-conforming use.

Joe Barden, Chairman, Forest View Citizens Advisory Committee, spoke with regard to relationship of industrial and residential development in the Forest View area.

Discussion with regard to relocation followed.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus, that the petition be denied and Council be requested to assist Mr. Solomon in relocation of his operations on land presently owned by the City in an area where industrial uses will not be incompatible with surrounding areas.

The Board's decision to recommend that this petition be denied are as follows:

This application presents some of the same problems associated with the other petition, namely Z-90-68, 3400 block Aurelius Road. The problems with this petition, however, are much more visible in that this is an existing use. The unsightliness of a contractor's yard; the clatter of the power wrench; the pounding; the drone of the drill; the yelling; the irregular hours and the traffic all testify to the need to separate this kind of land use from the residential neighborhood. These conditions no doubt influenced the Forest View Citizens Advisory Committee in their deliberations which have produced the Forest View Plan. The Plan suggests low density residential use of this property. (This was also proposed in the 1958 Master Plan.)

The trouble is, however, that the use exists and will continue to exist, regardless of the outcome of this petition. As has been documented elsewhere, the use, although non-conforming, is entirely legal. The Board and Council then, are presented with four alternatives:

Alternative A—Rezone the property as requested. An action of this kind would be contrary to both the 1958 Master Plan and the Plan currently being considered by the Board which has been developed by the citizens of the area. This rezoning would destroy the people's faith in the planning process.

Alternative B—Deny the petition. This action would be tantamount to no action at all. It would demonstrate to the petitioner that the Board and the Council were firm in their support of the Forest View Plan; however, as mentioned earlier it will have absolutely no positive affect in enhancing the livability of the neighborhood.

Alternative C—Deny the petition with the explicit intention of acquiring as soon as feasible, the subject property and making available a site in the proposed industrial areas south of Jolly Road.

Alternative D—Deny the petition and urge the Council to assist in the relocation of this industrial operation.

The Board adopted alternative D because it believed that the matter of relocation

and acquisition assistance should not be a condition of any denial. Rather, the Board believes that the petition ought to be denied on the merits of the petition and that the question of assistance should be at the discretion of the Council and not held as a lever to substantiate rezoning in the event relocation assistance is not possible.

Motion failed by the following vote.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus—4.

Nays: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Mr. Fink questioned residential density and was informed that at present it is sparse.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the area has in the past developed slowly due to the lack of public utilities, that utilities are now going into this area.

Matter referred to Council with adverse recommendation.

Z-92-68

Motion by Gaus, supported by Reynolds, that the petition to rezone property at 4700 Collins Road from "A-1" to "D-1" be tabled to the November 12, 1968, meeting.

It was suggested that the Citizens Advisory Committee consider using certain areas at Forest View as multi-family instead of single family as proposed.

Discussion regarding various land uses in the Forest View area followed.

STREETS COMMITTEE

Joshua Meadows Preliminary Plat—

Motion by Fink, supported by Black, that the preliminary plat of Joshua Meadows be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the plat be developed with complete public utilities and full street improvements as required by the City of Lansing Subdivision Control Ordinance.
2. That the necessary right-of-way for the extension of Joshua Street to Armstrong Road be acquired and included in the Plat.
3. All street rights-of-way shall be sixty-six (66) feet with thirty-six (36) foot pavements.
4. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Council approval.
5. That an easement for storm drainage purposes, if necessary, be provided.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

Mr. Black, Chairman, Ordinance Committee, referred to a recent phone call from an official of Oldsmobile who wanted to have Mr. Black meet with him and Mr. Boyd, Chamber of Commerce, and other industrialists to discuss the proposed provisions of new Zoning Ordinance with regard to industrial areas.

Mr. Black questioned if he did agree to meet with the official would he be out of order inasmuch as the new Zoning Ordinance has already been passed.

Mr. Guernsey stated that City Council prefers that the Planning Board and staff discuss with Chamber of Commerce-industrial committee, the amendments to the zoning district that they are proposing. Suggested that members of the staff attend the same meeting.

Mr. Guernsey stated that Council wishes the November 12, 1968, public hearing to be held at 7:00 p.m. so they may attend.

COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Guernsey stated that he had received a communication from MSPO Executive Secretary, Mr. Bruce Brown, requesting the Planning Board and staff join the City of East Lansing in joint sponsorship of American Conference of MSPO at Capital Park Motel, May 14-16.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Duncan, that resolution to join the City of East Lansing in this sponsorship and that all members of the Board participate.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

City Council invited the Planning Board to a meeting and dinner at 1861 House, 6:30, November 6, 1968, for a general discussion of planning.

It was suggested that the Planning Board request Council to reschedule to other than a Wednesday night so more Planning Board members could attend.

Discussion followed with regard to Forest View multi-family housing near the highway.

Mr. Fink stated that he thought the Planning Board should not take official action on the Plan at this meeting.

There was discussion regarding multi-family vs. single family in proximity to the highway.

Mr. Barden and Mr. DuBose were present with regard to the Forest View Master Plan Revision.

Mr. Nino explained the difference between density per acre as opposed to single family (i.e., so many dwelling units per acre could be either single family or town-house with a lot of open space).

Mr. Black stated that a formal resolution should be made that we as a Planning Board and as a staff have appreciated the

opportunity and the challenge that has been presented to the Planning Board and the Planning staff and equally to the development of Lansing by this citizens group.

To be presented to the Forest View Citizens Committee.

Communication from Mr. Cavanaugh regarding public hearings.

Discussion followed.

Meeting adjourned at 10:45 p.m.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF ELECTRICAL EXAMINERS OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 17, 1968

Members present: Howard Lutz, Carl Moore and Keith Norris—3.

Members absent: E. J. Baker and Dean Battley—2.

Inspectors present: Dale Hoover and Ray Dwyer—2.

Inspector absent: Donald E. Deal—1.

Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Norris.

Minutes of the last meeting were read and approved as printed.

Ron Blasen, 119 N. Fairview, was requested to appear with revised drawings to install a 100 amp. service in his new home under construction.

Motion made by Mr. Lutz and seconded by Mr. Baker that the permit be granted.

Passed.

Gary Armour, 709 Fenton Street, requested a home-owner's permit to install a 100 amp. service at his home, the above address.

His drawing was not complete and the Board recommended corrections to be presented to one of the electrical inspectors for approval.

Richard Huff, 5841 Hilliard, requested a home-owner's permit to install a 100 amp. service at his home, the above address.

He had no drawings and the examining board gave the inspectors approval to issue the permit upon receipt of a satisfactory drawing.

Leonard Chelsa, 5841 Rolfe Road, requested a home-owner's permit to install 100 amp. service at his home. Due to lack of information, request was denied.

Steve Cappalla, 827 E. St. Joseph Street, requested permission to write the Class "J" examination. The board requested more proof of previous experience.

Examinations from the last meeting were graded. Douglas Jones, Gary Kowatch and Harold Bell were found to have passing grades.

The Master-Cast electric furnaces does not carry the Underwriters Label and cannot be installed in the City of Lansing.

A motion was made by Mr. Moore and seconded by Mr. Lutz, to adjourn and passed.

Meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
RAY J. DWYER,
Acting Secretary.

N.M.

The change will not produce an over crowded condition as the lot is more than adequate in depth (181.5 ft.).

When taking a total view of the proposal, and the orientation of existing development, both on the site and adjacent to the site, the Board does not believe the change will seriously affect any adjoining property or the general welfare.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Six.

Nays: None.

NEW BUSINESS

Mr. Gaus stated that the applicant should be requested to attend these public hearings to testify in behalf of their request, and answer questions for the Board.

Mrs. Houck asked that Mr. Robbins, who prepares the applications, of the Building Department, be requested to inform each petitioner to appear at the public hearing.

Motion by Kelley, supported by Gaus, to send a communication to the Mayor, City Council and the Planning Board stat-

ing that: prompt action be taken on the New Zoning Ordinance.

Motion adopted unanimously.

Motion by Kelley, supported by Gaus, to approve the minutes of October 10, 1968, meeting and the Special Meeting of October 14, 1968.

Motion adopted unanimously.

REPORT FROM CHRISTMAS PARTY COMMITTEE

At: Celentino's Restaurant, December 13, 1968, at 7:30 p.m.

Invite: Mayor and Assistant and wives; Members of City Council and wives; Bernard Elliott, Building Department; Robert Robbins, Building Department; Mr. and Mrs. R. Guernsey; Mr. and Mrs. R. Nino; Mr. and Mrs. V. Fountain; Mr. and Mrs. E. Brown, Mr. and Mrs. G. Main.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND C. GUERNSEY,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, September 17, 1968

September 17, 1968

Court Room No. 1

6th Floor, City Hall

The meeting was called to order at 7:35 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Absent: Duncan and Fink—2.

Mrs. Bretz presented gavels in recognition of service to the following past Planning Board members: Thomas Campbell, Kenneth Ingersoll, Irma Longnecker,

Elmer Manson, Glen Manz, Rolland Siebert. They were commended for their service to the Lansing Community by donating many hours of their personal time to help build and improve our City.

HEARINGS

Z-81-68

Mr. Lloyd Bergren, 2777 Delman, Okemos, appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4806 S. Logan Street from "F" to "D-1" Professional Office District.

Mr. Bergren stated he was speaking in behalf of Mr. DeWald, the owner of the

subject property. He questioned the justification of the proposed rezoning, and noted that the subject property has been used commercial for quite some time.

Mr. Black questioned the zoning classification at the time of purchase by Mr. DeWald and was informed that Mr. Bergen was under the impression that the property was commercial. Mr. Black stated he understood that Mr. DeWald requested the commercial zoning and has not proceeded with development under the commercial zoning.

Mr. Guernsey explained the background of this property.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

P-10-68

Kahres Farm Subdivision,

Preliminary Plat

Mr. Main, of the Planning Staff, discussed the proposed subdivision in regard to size, boundary, land use in the area, and possible changes in the street pattern as proposed; however, nothing has yet been resolved regarding the street pattern.

Mr. Reynolds questioned the status of the zoning on this property at the City Council and was informed by Mr. Guernsey that it has been referred to the Planning Committee of Council. Discussion occurred as to having the public hearing on the proposed subdivision before the resolution of the zoning matter. Mr. Guernsey noted that the Council is considering the zoning issue and the Board considering the subdivision issue. The Board would make their recommendation on the preliminary plat after the Council action on the zoning matter. He stated that these are two separate legal processes.

Richard Neller, developer, was present and stated that the preliminary plat is obviously tied in with zoning petition previously submitted. Ultimate decision made on this plat, in his opinion, depends considerably on the outcome of the zoning petition.

Rex Teeters, 420 E. Miller Rd., questioned the proposed project as to location.

Art Jackson, 6264 Gardenia, questioned the possibility of Gardenia being widened. Mr. Hino replied that the staff is considering having Gardenia extended to Edgewood. Persons interested in this matter are invited to visit the Planning Department for further information.

Mr. Neller commented that the street pattern will take more communication between their company and interested persons to come to some decisions. He has the highest intentions of developing this property and we can't do it without your approval. Concessions will be made on our part but also we firmly believe that

the City, in behalf of all the people in the City, will have to determine whether or not they want development in the City or not. Since the recommendation of this board it has been interesting for us to hear comments from acquaintances. It is, in our opinion, inconceivable to think of this area as a low density area whether commercial or residential.

Martin Lawrence, 350 E. Miller Road, questioned future planning of the area that would indicate that houses along Miller Road would be eliminated. He understood that Miller Road would be widened.

Roland Brown, 428 E. Miller Road, questioned the type of residential buildings proposed.

Mr. Neller replied that it was their intent that there would be no single family detached housing on individual lots. Possibilities that exist are typical apartment complexes, townhouses, and numerous concepts which have not been seen much in this area. We would hope it would be group housing of some kind.

Mr. Guernsey commented that the Department and Board have encouraged Mr. Neller in the development of this site to include housing with as much a family orientation as possible.

Mrs. Bradley, 117 W. Oakland, spoke in objection. In that she felt that the single family neighborhoods were becoming hard to find. Would like to see this area remain residential as it is now.

Mrs. Arthur Jackson, 6264 Gardenia, asked about Neller's plan of two years ago.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Neller stated conditions have changed in the last two years. Felt we can do a better job by group houses than separate units. Can provide more homes for more people. This is not really a very desirable neighborhood for single family housing as you go toward Cedar Street and Edgewood Boulevard.

Approximately 24 persons were present in regard to this matter.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess 8:45 p.m. to 9:10 p.m.

Mr. Russell Fink arrived during the recess period.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-82-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that this matter be removed from the table for consideration at this time.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

A letter from Elmer J. Manson, the owner of the property, requesting that the proposed rezoning for this property be referred, was read by Mr. Guernsey.

Mr. Black asked for a clarification of the sequence of events, which was given by Mr. Guernsey.

Mr. Fink expressed a doubt of the proposed use being contiguous with heavy industrial and the conglomeration of other uses in the area.

Mr. Reynolds asked why not wait on the rezoning until the study of the area is completed.

Mr. Nino remarked that the staff felt quite confident from a planning point of view that any plan in the future would not advise "D-M" density for this property.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Heino, that the petition to rezone property at 604-612 W. Willow Street from "D-M" to "D-M:1" be approved.

The reasons for the Board's concern over the existing zoning and the recommendation to reduce the possible density is as follows:

1. The density that would be permitted under the "D-M" classification will be incompatible with the future proposed densities and would therefore constitute an indiscriminate spot zone.
2. The Planning Board did not recommend the present category and had there been a medium density zoning category it is most likely that Council would have zoned the land "D-M:1".
3. "D-M" density, approximately 54 units, would in the opinion of the Board overdevelop this property whereas some 27 units would provide an environment more in keeping with the proposed future character of this area.
4. The existing zoning establishes a precedent which could be very costly to the City by requiring substantial new drainage facilities.
5. The Consumers Power Company installation does not in the opinion of the Board adversely affect the area to the point where a decent residential environment could not be maintained.

A number of people expressed concern that the property be developed so as not to adversely affect the surrounding residential community.

The petitioner is not in agreement with the Board's recommendation.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus and Heino—6.

Nays: Fink and Reynolds—2.

Mr. Reynolds commented that one of the deciding factors of the Planning Board's previous denial recommendation for "D-M" on this property was that Consumers Power was worried about having families and children next to their property.

STREETS COMMITTEE

ROW-11-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Blackall, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the request to vacate that portion of Juniper Street extending north of Briarfield Drive to the property line of Reo School be denied.

Juniper Drive extends from Briarfield Drive on the south, in a northerly direction approximately 98 ft. to the southern boundary of the Reo Elementary School. It serves as an access to the Reo Elementary School. If it were to be vacated the school children living on Briarfield Drive would have to travel to school via Logan Street and Reo Road, a considerable distance. The Board of Education believes this should be retained by the City.

The Public Service Department has storm and sanitary sewers in the right-of-way and recommends that it not be vacated. The Board of Water and Light has a 6 in. water main on Juniper Street and primary and secondary electric lines installed along the south property line of the Reo School. The Fire Department disapproves this vacation as it is needed for access to the school and as an evacuation route in case of fire at the school. The Board believes this stub street serves a necessary purpose as an access to Reo School and a public utility right-of-way and should be retained by the City.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

BP-10-68

Motion by Blackall, seconded by Heino, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the offer to sell property to the City which is located at 4632 Pleasant Grove Road be approved.

Public streets dedicated in the past were frequently of an inadequate width or a half width, awaiting the platting on the opposite side of the street and an addi-

tional street dedication. That section of Reo Road extending westerly from Pleasant Grove Road for 1327.7 feet had only a 25-foot right-of-way. The Reo Road housing project has provided for an additional street width and the only section of Reo Road without a 50-foot width is that which abuts the subject property on the south.

The southwest section of the City is an area of major growth and streets of adequate width should be provided for roadways, sidewalks, and utilities. This should have been accomplished in connection with the Reo Road project, as the additional street right-of-way is needed to service the project and the surrounding community.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

ORDINANCE COMMITTEE

SS-25-68

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the following amendment to the Zoning Code which provides that the setback in areas being redeveloped will be set back the distance required by that particular zoning category rather than the existing average of the block, be approved.

Section 36-44 (4)—Delete fourth paragraph commencing: . . . "Provided, however, where lots comprising forty percent . . ." to end of paragraph, and substitute with:

"Provided, however, where prior development has taken place the front yard requirement for vacant lots or existing homes to which additions are planned, need not exceed the average setback of the dwelling units nearest either side of the vacant lot or residence to which additions are planned, except that under no circumstances need a greater setback be provided than the minimum required by this section."

Section 36-45 (4)—Delete part of the first paragraph (p. 636) commencing at the fourth line: "Provided, however, where lots comprising (40) percent . . ." to end of paragraph and substitute:

"Provided, however, where prior development has taken place the front yard requirement for vacant lots or existing homes to which additions are planned, need not exceed the average setback of the dwelling units nearest either side of the vacant lot or residence to which additions are planned, except that under no circumstances need a greater setback be provided than the minimum required by this section."

Section 36-46 (4)—Delete 2nd paragraph commencing: "Where lots comprising forty percent (40%) . . ." to end of paragraph.

Section 36-47 (4)—Delete 2nd paragraph commencing: "Where lots comprising forty percent (40%) . . ." to end of paragraph.

Section 36-47.1 (4)—Delete 3rd paragraph commencing: "Where lots comprising forty percent (40%) . . ." to end of paragraph.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

SS-15-68

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that the following amendment to the Zoning Code which provides specifically for housing for the elderly be approved:

Add Subsection (8) to Section 36-23 of the Code which shall read as follows:

(8) Uses subject to Special Conditions:

(a) Elderly housing subject to special conditions: Housing specifically designed to meet the special needs of elderly citizens shall be permitted, subject to the conditions hereinafter imposed for this use and subject further to the review and approval of a site plan by the Planning Department.

A. All housing for the elderly shall be provided as a planned development consisting of at least one (1) acre, and such buildings shall not exceed the height limitations of the "D-M" District. Such housing may also provide for the following:

1. Cottage type dwellings and/or apartment type dwelling units.
2. Common services containing, but not limited to, central dining rooms, recreational rooms, central lounge, and workshops.

B. All dwellings shall consist of at least three hundred and fifty (350) square feet per unit (not including kitchen and sanitary facilities).

C. Total coverage of all buildings (including dwelling units and related service buildings) shall not exceed fifty (50) percent of the total site exclusive of any dedicated public right-of-way.

D. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each two dwelling units and one for each employee.

E. In the "D-M" Multiple Family District the total number of rooms of eighty (80) square feet or more (not includ-

ing kitchens and sanitary facilities) shall not be more than the area of the parcel, in square feet, divided by nine hundred (900). In the "D-M" District for the purpose of computing the permitted number of dwelling units per acre the following room assignments shall control:

Efficiency 1 room

One Bedroom 2 rooms

Two Bedroom 3 rooms

F. Screening and/or fencing as may be required by the Planning Board.

G. In the event the use reverts to a conventional apartment use, all the provisions of the "D-M" District shall apply.

Section 86-26 to be amended by the addition of Subsection (5) which shall read as follows:

(5) Uses Subject to Special Conditions:

(a) Elderly housing subject to special condition. Housing specifically designed to meet the special needs of elderly citizens shall be permitted, subject to the conditions hereinafter imposed for this use and subject further to the review and approval of a site plan by the Planning Department.

A. All housing for the elderly shall be provided as a planned development consisting of at least (1) acre, and such buildings shall not exceed the height limitations of the "D-M" District. Such housing may also provide for the following:

1. Cottage type dwellings and/or apartment type dwelling units.

2. Common services containing, but not limited to, central dining rooms, recreational rooms, central lounge, and workshops.

B. All dwellings shall consist of at least three hundred and fifty (350) square feet per unit (not including kitchen and sanitary facilities).

C. Total coverage of all buildings (including dwelling units and related service buildings) shall not exceed fifty (50) percent of the total site exclusive of any dedicated public right-of-way.

D. One (1) parking space shall be provided for each two dwelling units and one for each employee. Should units revert to general occupancy, then two (2) spaces per unit shall be provided.

E. In the "D-M" Multiple Family District the total number of rooms of eighty (80) square feet or more (not including kitchens and sanitary facilities) shall not be more than the area of the parcel, in square feet, divided by four

hundred and fifty (450). In the "D-M" District for the purpose of computing the permitted number of dwelling units per acre the following room assignments shall control:

Efficiency 1 room

One Bedroom 2 rooms

Two Bedroom 3 rooms

F. Screening and/or fencing as may be required by the Planning Board.

G. In the event the use reverts to a conventional apartment use, all the provisions of the "D-M" District shall apply.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Blackall, Bretz, Duncan, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—8.

Nays: None.

SS-22-68

The intent of the proposed amendment is to require the erection of fences and walls where less restrictive zones abut more restrictive zones and to regulate the erection of fences.

The observation was made the owners of industrial and commercial property should not have to build fences every time they acquire property adjacent to residential property.

Two insertions were suggested: (1) that provisions of this amendment would not apply to residential lots, within areas designated as industrial or commercial in the Master Plan. (2) Other areas where fences might actually detract from appearance of neighborhood where residential and industrial abut.

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that this matter be referred back to the Ordinance Committee for report at the October 15, 1968, Planning Board meeting.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

SS-11-65

Mr. Spackman, of the Planning staff, discussed the rough draft of the City Market Study now in progress. He stated that further information would soon be available. He asked for the Board's review and comments, particularly as to the recommendations and data preceding, after which this matter will again be placed on the Board's agenda for discussion.

URBAN RENEWAL

Mr. Reynolds reported that the Urban Redevelopment Board had reduced the

boundaries of the proposed Urban Renewal Project No. 3.

Mr. Guernsey pointed out that those areas to be deleted could possibly be included in future rehabilitation projects.

Industrial Development Standards—

Motion by Black, seconded by Reynolds, that this report be received and referred to the Ordinance Committee for report at the October 15, 1968, meeting of the Board.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Mr. Black questioned the status of the Sign Ordinance. Mr. Guernsey informed that it was adopted by the City as part of the Building Code. The Council's direction for a sign code revision is still very active, and they are awaiting a recommendation of the Planning Board.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Guernsey presented for discussion the proposed policy of the Board to notify those persons within 300 feet on a proposed rezoning matter.

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that the staff be instructed to prepare a statement to amend rules of procedure with the stipulation that the people to whom notices are sent reside in the dwelling units within the 300 feet area.

Discussion followed as to the source of gathering names for notification. The City

Directory or Bresser's Index were suggested rather than the tax rolls.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Black, that this matter be referred back to the Executive Committee for further consideration.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Mr. Duncan asked that the Committee consider the following aspects of the above tabled motion as to who should receive what: (1) condominium dwellings where large number of owners as well as occupants exists; (2) relatively expensive rental units where the occupants are very concerned; also persons not in expensive units who are also very interested.

WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Guernsey stated that the Department is attempting to structure the work program. A job assignment and scheduling chart are being prepared. This will be distributed to the Board soon for their comments and suggestions.

COMMUNICATION

Letter from the Los Angeles City Planning Department regarding their revision of their comprehensive zoning ordinance was read by Mr. Guernsey.

Received and placed on file.

Meeting adjourned at 11:10 p.m.

T.C.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October 1, 1968

The meeting was called to order at 7:46 by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds—4.

Absent: Black, Blackall, Duncan, Heino—4.

HEARINGS

P-11-68 Joshua Meadows, Preliminary Plat

Mr. Main of the Planning Staff discussed the site factors regarding the subject proposal. He stated that the developer proposes a street system which would extend from Joshua Street north from its present limit to Armstrong. A loop street would serve the eastern half of the subdivision. Northrup would extend easterly to Joshua Street. The land will be divided into 55 two family lots (average size 70' x 132') a commercial lot, and a large lot which the developer is proposing for use as a planned unit development.

Peter Jackson, 568 Armstrong, questioned the definition of a Community Unit Development.

Howard Angell, the developer, replied that there is no Community Unit Plan proposed. The land would be set aside, and he thought it would stay two family until some later date.

Mr. Jackson stated that he was not opposed to the two family, but to the road pattern because of additional traffic it would generate.

Mr. Tom Peacock, 5619 Joshua, stated he was not opposed to the C-3 but would object to apartment buildings.

Harold West, 524 E. Northrup, stated his concern about the traffic problem in the area, that he had notified the Safety Commission about the traffic problem at North and Kaynorth Streets. He asked if the Planning Board would take the traffic problem into consideration.

Mr. Main stated that the intersection would be at right angles rather than a curve as it is now.

Approximately 12 persons were present in regard to the proposed subdivision.

Matter was referred to the Streets Committee.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 8:05 P.M.

Z-85-68

Mr. Fountain of the Planning Staff discussed this request for approval of a Community Unit Plan for property located in the 2000 block of West Miller Road. The developer has submitted the following:

a total of 330 townhouse units; off-street parking consisting of 674 spaces or 2.04 spaces per dwelling unit; density proposed is 7.9 dwelling units per gross acre; buildings, drives, and parking areas cover approximately 25% of the total land area; ingress and egress to the site would be from Miller and Grovenberg Roads, and Edgewood Boulevard from the east; land use in the vicinity of the site is single family to the north and west, the I-96 freeway to the south, and a similar townhouse project under construction to the east.

Eugene Zeimet, Smookler Company, the developers, stated they are trying to extend the concept of streamlined park to this development.

Mr. Black arrived at 8:10 P.M.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-89-68

This is a request to rezone property at 1023 W. Ottawa Street from D-M Multiple to D-1 Professional Office District.

Mr. Guernsey read a letter which had been submitted by the petitioner, Larry

D. Fowler which stated: "I did upon this date receive notice of a hearing set for October 1, 1968 at 7:30 P.M. Inasmuch as I intend to be out of town on the date of the hearing, please accept this letter and present it at the hearing in my absence.

The Petition for Proposed Re-zoning, in the event that the property is rezoned, would be owner-occupied and used for purposes of law offices to house my present practice. The parking area to the rear of the building will be expanded to meet with the zoning requirements for professional use. I would point out that the traffic is, and parking requirements for law offices are, much less than for other professions such as medical, real estate, insurance or other allied professions. I would further point out that there are many commercial locations on Logan Street corners in near proximity and other professional locations on Ottawa Street in near proximity. Further, that relocation of the new Capitol complex and proposed capitol building relocation will be within one block to the above location.

I believe that one of the characteristics of owner-occupied property insures that the property will be, at all times, well maintained.

I welcome your comments."

/s/ Larry D. Fowler

Mr. John Maloney, 1019 W. Ottawa spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning.

Lloyd Matt, 114 N. Logan, questioned the parking requirements, which Mr. Nino explained.

David Duncan explained the process of rezoning for those present.

Mildred Richardson, 1014 W. Ottawa, asked if property owners could be notified on further developments regarding the proposed rezoning. She objected to the present use of the site and thought a law office would be an improvement.

Mr. Maloney suggested that the petitioner contact the property owners and state his intentions, that he thought this would be to his benefit.

Mrs. Bretz suggested those interested in this matter contact the Planning Department for further information.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-90-68

Petition by Edward F. Solomon to rezone property in the 3400 block of Aurelius Road from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial, approximately 22 acres.

Z-91-68

Petition by Edward F. Solomon to rezone property at 3412 Aurelius Road from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial, approximately 7 acres.

Mr. Solomon, 3412 Aurelius, stated he had decided to forfeit the request for industrial on the east side of Aurelius in consideration of a vote taken at the Forest View Citizens Meeting.

Mr. Joe Barden, Chairman of the Forest View Committee discussed the formation of the Forest View Citizens groups. Speaking for himself he opposed light industrial north of Cavanaugh and along Aurelius Road.

Mr. Solomon stated that the property on the east side of Aurelius is not being used, that he proposed to give up petition for rezoning on the east side of Aurelius. There had been an injunction served to stop use of that site. There is equipment stored on the premises, which will be moved.

W. Metzger, 2614 Wabash, stated he could see large piles of tires which were not covered.

Mr. Cullen DuBose, Forest View Citizens Committee member, 2718 Wabash, objected to the rezoning on both the east and west side of Aurelius Road, that it would set a dangerous precedent in the area that it would be a spot zoning. He stated that the Forest View Committee has spent much time trying to work out a suitable development for this area.

Margaret Metzgar, 2614 Wabash, submitted letters from individuals in the area stating their thoughts on this matter. She thought it would be detrimental to new school center.

Alan Trapp, 3106 Manley, objected to the proposed rezoning.

Harry Rice, 1023 Irvington, stated he was not in favor of any industrial zoning in the area.

Mrs. Atherton stated she did not think Mr. Solomon had quit operating on the east side of Aurelius Road.

Mr. Gaus questioned if the west side of Aurelius was intended for a greater use, and if the west side was not rezoned industrial would it follow that Solomon could not use it as it is now.

Mr. Guernsey replied that the land could be used as it exists now, however no construction or addition to buildings could be done.

Mr. Solomon stated that he plans to erect a storage building on the west parcel. Does not intend to use for anything different than it is now. Erection of a building would in no way alter the use of the property.

Mr. Gaus questioned how long Solomon had been at the present location, and he replied since about 1952 on the east side and since about 1962 on the west, that the property was purchased by them in about 1932.

Mr. Reynolds asked if they had any other property zoned commercial which would be suitable and was informed by Solomon that they had no other property which would handle their facilities. Mr. Reynolds asked how many homes on the west side of Aurelius were built before or after their operation began.

Roy Taylor, 2021 Wabash, spoke in objection to the rezoning on the east side. He had no objection to the rezoning on the west side.

Joe Barden presented a U. S. Geological Survey Map which showed individual structures in the area in question in 1965.

Mr. Reynolds questioned that since the Forest View Committee objected to the proposed rezonings, did they have an area designated for this industrial type of use in their proposed plan?

Mr. Barden informed him that south of Cavanaugh and west of Aurelius was designated for light industrial zoning. South of Jolly and east and west of Aurelius to the expressway is set aside for light industrial in the proposed plan.

Marion Taylor, 2628 Wabash, objected to both proposed rezonings.

Gilbert Holmes, 2914 Forest Road, spoke in regard to the Solomon operation being dormant for many years, that it had just recently expanded.

Mr. Duncan wondered if Mr. Solomon might be mistaken about the coverage of material stored on the east side, in light of comments of those present. Mr. Solomon hoped he was right, if not he had an apology to make.

Mrs. Duff, 3323 Aurelius Road, complained about the dust raised by the Solomon operation and suggested the Board review the area.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-92-68

Petition by Boron Oil Company to rezone property at 4700 Collins Road from A-1 Family to D-1 Professional and "F" Commercial.

Mr. Charles Hopkins, representative of prospective purchaser of the land, introduced Mr. Ronald Harpst, representative of Boron Oil Company, present owners of the land; Professor Charles W. Barr, consultant to prospective purchaser; and Mr. William D. Parsley, attorney for the

prospective purchaser as being present in behalf of the petition.

The petitioners submitted a written statement containing the nature of the request; background; reasons for rezoning a portion of lot No. 2 to D-1; and the reasons for rezoning two parcels to "F" Commercial, which is on file in the Planning Department.

Mr. Ed Remick, Board of Education, spoke in support of the proposed rezoning.

Matter was referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-93-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 711, 715, 727 N. Capitol and 210 W. Saginaw Street from "D" Apartment to D-1 Professional.

Z-94-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 209, 211 W. Lapeer, 531, 535 N. Capitol and 505 N. Capitol Avenue from D-M to D-1 Professional.

Z-95-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 211, 213 W. Oakland, 801, 807, 811, 815, 823-25, 827-29, 831 N. Capitol and 210, 212 W. Madison from D-M Multiple to D-1 Professional.

Z-96-68

Petition initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 212 W. Lapeer, 215 W. Saginaw, 205 W. Saginaw, 601, 615 N. Capitol from "F" Commercial to D-1 Professional.

Mr. Fountain discussed the present zoning and use of each proposed rezoning being considered.

Mr. Nino informed that the purpose of the suggested changes is to bring the zoning and land use development into conformance with the Central City Development Plan.

Matters were referred to the Zoning Committee.

Recess from 10:30 to 10:45 P.M.

Motion by Gaus supported by Reynolds that the minutes of July 2 and July 16, 1968 be approved as printed. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-73-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that the petition filed by J. B. Grammatico to rezone property at 1017 Reo Road from A-1 to D-M: 1 be tabled thirty days to enable the petitioner to submit a Community Unit Plan for the property.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-75-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property in the 3900 block of South Logan Street from A-1 to D-1 be denied.

The reasons upon which the Board bases its recommendation in this regard are as follows:

(1) In the first instance such rezoning would be inconsistent with the plan the Planning Board has adopted to guide it in making land use decisions on South Logan Street, which plan emphasizes discouraging the tendency of major streets to develop in a strip or ribbon commercial nature.

(2) The parcel of land in question is part of a comparatively large open area which should be assembled to achieve a planned development over this entire area. The indiscriminate division of these properties together with individual lot development would prevent this large area from full utilization while at the same time create a hodge podge like development. For example the lot division in question would propose almost land locking the balance of the property in question except for a small easement. Dependence upon easements as access to developed land is hardly a desirable solution to land development.

(3) If this frontage is rezoned then what basis is there for denying similar application for land contiguous this property and similarly for an application contiguous the next, the next, and the next.

(4) Last, but not least an appraisal of land availability for office use in the general area of this site would reveal that there are alternative available lands. The Board has made such a survey and is satisfied as to the authenticity of this statement.

The Council is aware that the approach which we propose to take to the development of South Logan Street has received support from many responsible people and concerned agencies.

Insofar as the results of the Board's Public Hearing are pertinent to this issue we would advise that there was no opposition to this petition of said Public Hearing.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-78-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the petition to rezone property at 1000 and 1008 Pierce Road and 4301, 3, 5, South Logan from A-1 to B-1 be tabled pending a site plan being submitted by the applicant which would reflect the following:

1. Location of existing and proposed buildings;
2. Location of off-street parking;
3. Points of ingress and egress to the site;
4. Disposition of existing residence;
5. Screening around parking lot and contiguous single family residence.

Motion carried by unanimous vote:

Z-81-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 4806 S. Logan from "F" to D-1 be approved.

The Board recommends to the Council that this property be rezoned for the following reasons:

(1) The Board through a series of rezoning changes expects to bring about a logical and harmonious land use pattern emanating from the intersection of Jolly and South Logan Streets. The pattern which would be established if the Council concurs would have certain lands at the intersection zoned for retail commercial uses, surrounding this an area for offices and surrounding the offices an area of multiple family housing and finally transcending to single family. The property in question ought to be for professional office use as south of the property is a shopping center and immediately north is an apartment project (Dorchester Circle). Said rezoning would therefore create this blending or transition.

(2) The above land use approach is consistent with a policy plan adopted by the Planning Board.

(3) This rezoning should not affect the ability of the present owner from enjoying an equal financial reward as the present zoning.

Therefore, the Planning Board recommends that the land described as, Com-

mencing at the NE corner of Lot 32, thence N. 89° 54' W. 391.5 ft. S. 77° 37' W. 180 ft., S. 89° 53' E. along the north line of Briarfield Drive 389.3 ft. to the west line of South Logan Street, thence northerly along west line of South Logan Street to the beginning, excluding the easterly 10 feet thereof, Supervisor's Plat No. 4, be rezoned from "F" Commercial District to D-1 Professional Office District.

This approach to Logan St. has received considerable support, however at the specific public hearing held in this regard there was no particular expression other than by the owner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-83-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Fink, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 227-231 N. Holmes Street from C-2 Family to "J" Parking be approved.

The basis for the Board's recommendation for rezoning the property in question for "J" Parking purposes is as follows:

(1) This rezoning would permit the extension of the existing parking lot on the west side of North Holmes Street and as such merely shifts from one place to another any adverse influence.

(2) The provision of off-street parking facilities will lessen congestion on the existing streets around the hospital and deter curb side parking which could offset some of the adverse influence this use has on nearby residential properties.

The Board therefore recommends that lots 8 and 9 of Block C, Gower's Addition be rezoned from "C" Two-Family Residence District to "J" Parking District. It should further be recognized that the existing three (3) foot high chain link fence with redwood interwoven slats will be continued north along the west street line and a similar fence will be erected along the north line of lot 9.

No one spoke in opposition to this rezoning at the Planning Board's hearing.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-84-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to

City Council that the petition to rezone property in the 5300 block of S. Cedar from D-M Multiple to "F" Commercial be denied.

The Board's recommendation for denial is based upon the following reasoning:

(1) This rezoning if granted continues the ribbon or strip commercial nature of South Cedar Street which is undesirable for the reasons well documented in the past decisions and because of the increasing acceptance to the theory that strip commercial is unattractive and more importantly unnecessary to achieve the demands for commercial space.

(2) This parcel is large enough to be developed with non commercial uses and more importantly with reverse frontage which would not in any further compound the inadequacies of South Cedar Street.

(3) The continuation of commercial development on South Cedar Street is merely compounding its inability to handle the traffic demands being made of this street, thereby hastening the day when further alternative routes will be required or a costly widening program will have to be undertaken. The 127 freeway connector is an example of costly alternatives due to the fact that the City did not wisely regulate uses on South Cedar Street. It is quite possible that even other routes will be required to handle north-south movements if the existing routes are further incapacitated. Reverse frontage development of vacant lands, elimination of some commercial or restricted access could eliminate this possibility.

In view of the above agreement this Plannig Board recommends that the rezoning requested in the above noted petition be denied.

No opposition was voiced at the public hearing in regards to this petition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-86-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 919, 921, 933, 935 Reo Road from A-1 Family to C-2 Family District be denied as filed and that the south 140 ft. of lots 40 and 41, also the south 140 ft. of the west 37.7 ft. of lot 39 Sonnenberg's Half Acre Subdivision be rezoned from "A-1" Family Residential to "C-2" Family Residential.

The Board further recommends that the south 140 ft. of lots 37 and 38, the south 140 ft. of the east 50.3 ft. of lot 39, the south 140 ft. of lots 42 and 43, Sonnen-

berg's Half Acre Sub., also the south 140 ft. of the property described as commencing at the northeast corner of lot 37, thence east 25 ft. south 296 ft., thence west 25 ft. to the southeast corner of said lot, thence north 296 ft. to beginning, be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "C-2" Family.

The Board makes this recommendation to the Council because it believes a two family zone would provide a desirable zone of transition between the townhouses south of Vincent Court and the single family homes on Reo Road.

Moreover the people who own the single family homes likewise own the property fronting on Vincent Court and they appear to support this rezoning.

Council's public hearing in this regard should include the area over and above what was petitioned for in Z-86-68. In connection with the Board's hearing there was no opposition expressed to this rezoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-87-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 2900 Seventh Avenue from A-1 Family to "H" Light Industrial be approved so as to permit an existing use now non-conforming to expand and to become a legal use.

The Planning Board realizes that its staff is engaged in a consultant role to this Community with the aim of achieving a proposed long range development plan for the North East Street Corridor Area. The Board further recognizes that its action may appear to be inconsistent with the concept of citizen participation, however it believes its actions are justified in this case for the following reasons:

(1) An analysis based upon the professional judgment of its staff would support the view that the long range use of the land in question ought to be industrial.

(2) A rezoning at this time will in effect improve existing conditions as it would allow the petitioner to put under cover uses of the property which he is now forced to do in the open air. Furthermore the use itself is not considered to be objectionable in the sense that it generates traffic or any obnoxious emissions.

The Board further recommends that the ordinance rezoning this property provide that:

(1) Off-street parking be provided on the basis of a minimum of "5" parking spaces and an additional 1 space for each 1½ employees.

(2) That all outside storage be physically screened from view and that such screening be to the satisfaction of the Planning Department.

At its public hearing in this regard several property owners appeared and expressed their concern over this rezoning.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Z-88-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 6900 S. Cedar Street from A-1 Family to "F" Commercial be approved to permit the expansion of the existing used car sales agency to include snowmobiles and travel trailers of various types.

(1) Recent rezoning recommendations would have all that land lying east of S. Cedar Street south to I-96 and north of Willoughby zoned for industrial purposes, therefore it is not considered undesirable that the west side of S. Cedar be commercial.

(2) The proposed use has regional significance and therefore its relative proximity to the freeway interchange makes its location desirable for the use in question.

No one appeared at the public hearing held by the Planning Board in this regard.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

The following is a list of zoning changes the staff recommends to the Planning Board for their consideration.

4220 S. Logan St.—Northwest corner of South Logan Street and Mary Avenue, 58-5900 block of S. Pennsylvania Avenue; property adjacent to 1-496 east of the sanitary landfill, west of Pinetree Road; 4711 and 4900 block south Logan Street. The present zoning and use of these properties was discussed and the proposed zoning was presented to the Board.

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the staff be authorized to file petitions with the City Council to change

the zoning on the above described properties as recommended.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-9-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the preliminary plat of Abood Ramada Subdivision be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. The existing Bolter Drain and its 100 ft. easement is to be shown on the plat.

2. All lots shall be graded so that surface water will drain to the street.

3. Curb, gutter, and sidewalk are to be built along Pennsylvania Avenue and Miller Road abutting this plat.

4. Approval of this plat by the Michigan Department of State Highways.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

ROW-12-68

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the request of the Leeland Steel and Iron Company to vacate the portion of Bates Street from the east right of way line of Ninth Avenue east to the west right of way from the south right of way line of Bates Street, south 156 ft. be approved for the section of Ninth Street subject to utility easements, and that the section of Bates Street requested for vacation be retained by the City as a possible east west connection between Lake Lansing Road and North East Street.

The subject street stubs have never improved and at the present time are used exclusively by the Leeland Steel and Iron Company (D.B. and H Rent Account) which has erected gates closing off the section of the streets requested to be vacated.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES

BP-11-68

Motion by Duncan, seconded by Gaus, that the Planning Board recommend to

the City Council that purchase of park land in the area between Delta River Drive, North Grand River and Waverly Road area be acquired for park purposes providing negotiations can bring about a suitable purchase price.

The northwestern section of the City, located between Delta River Drive, N. Grand River and east of Waverly Road, will be completely developed within the next couple of years. If additional park lands are not obtained now, they will not be available with the full development of the area. The proposed development to the north and west is to erect 100 family units and 40 units of elderly housing, with limited open areas being available to the occupants of the proposed development. The site location is desirable, for a neighborhood park facility, to serve the existing and proposed residential development in the area.

The Park Board at their meeting of September 11, 1968 recommended to the Planning Board and City Council that the City negotiate for the Purchase of this land.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Reynolds, Duncan and Black—6.

Nays: None.

Mr. Black called the Board's attention to an editorial in the Monday, September 30, 1968 edition of the Detroit Free Press. He commented that if S. Logan, S. Cedar and N. East Streets were substituted in the editorial for Detroit's major thoroughfares it would apply to Lansing. He asked that the excerpt be included in the minutes.

"Detroit's Major Streets: Must They Be So Ugly? When the great City Planner In the Sky finally hands down enough money for us to rebuild our cities, we have a suggestion to those who disburse the funds.

Don't forget the major thoroughfares.

It is our growing conviction that parts of some of our major avenues—Jefferson, Grand River, Woodward, Gratiot,—would be major contenders in an Ugly Contest that could be arranged for American cities. The city is notoriously overbuilt with commercial property and small shops that lack adequate parking and clientele. The strip zoning must have begun before Cadillac got out of town.

And the prospect for the future along many of these thoroughfares is nothing but more and more decay. The shops are not accessible enough to automobile trade, and they can't attract enough neighborhood walk-in trade.

So the avenues are ugly and getting uglier.

We would not dare suggest a new project to the City of Detroit that would cost cash money. But surely someday, somehow we will be trying to do a more thorough job of rebuilding our city. Why then not give the thought that has so obviously been lacking in the past to the creation of more tree lined, well spaced, adequately landscaped major surface streets?

And why must the suburbs, some of which still have some distance yet to travel down the road to urban decay, repeat the same pattern so often?

The answer is, of course, that people are simply trying to make a buck. But we wonder whether the long range result is rewarding, even to those whose scale of values begins and ends with the dollar mark. The better bet is that the neglect in the past is going to cost all of us—us and our children—quite a lot."

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that this editorial be forwarded to City Council with the Planning Board's concurrence, indicating the interchange of Lansing's S. Cedar, S. Logan and N. East in place of Detroit's thoroughfares.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Motion by Fink, seconded by Black, that the Planning Board change their first meeting date in November from November

5 to November 12, 1968 due to November 5 being election day.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported that the Department has a Planner VIII position open due to promotion of Mr. Tubbs to CRP. He requested that this position be reduced to a Planner VII position, which would permit the hiring of an individual whom it is felt meets the VII position but not the VIII. This request is to be made with the stipulation that at a later date the VIII position be reinstated.

The Work Program was distributed to the Board with the comment that they would receive reports periodically as they become available.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from Joe Barden, Chairman of the Forest View Citizens Advisory Committee was received and placed on file.

Letter from Bruce Maguire was distributed to the Planning Board members. Mr. Guernsey stated that the staff would prepare a reply.

Meeting adjourned at 11:45.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, October, 15, 1968

The meeting was called to order at 7:15 P.M. by Mrs. Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—5.

Absent: Blackhall, Duncan and Fink—3.

Mr. Guernsey presented the format of the meeting. He noted that the meeting was to be in two parts—No. 1, The Forest View

Community Development Plan, and after a short recess, part No. 2—The central City Master Plan Revision for the City of Lansing.

Mr. Guernsey stated that the Citizens Advisory Committee would present to the Planning Board a development plan for the Forest View Community, and that the Planning Board would then hold a hearing on the plan.

The Planning Board, Councilman Perrin, Joe Barden, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee, and members of the Citizens Advisory Committee were introduced.

Mr. Barden gave a brief explanation of the function of the Citizens Advisory Committee and what has been done since the meeting on June 5, 1968. He stated that there will be a panel discussion by Ben Williams with the Board of Education with regard to the lunches and bussing of students in the City Hall Court Room on October 22, 1968.

Mr. Fink arrived at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Guernsey introduced Mr. Al Tubbs and Mr. Wm. Bechtel of the Planning Department staff.

Mr. Tubbs continued the meeting by giving a brief background of the Forest View Community based on the 1960 Master Plan for Lansing. He also mentioned the recent pressures for changes in land use within the community. He stated that these pressures are the result of trends which have occurred in the Community since 1960 such as:

1. The dynamic growth of the City of Lansing since 1960, causing an acute housing shortage.

2. A change in the style of living that has taken place reflected by the fact that many new housing units (apartments, etc.) have been built.

3. Pressures from the location of the interchanges along the interstate highway system.

4. The demand by citizens to have a more effective voice in determining the type of community in which they will live.

Mr. Tubbs noted various problems which no doubt will arise, and pointed out that the ability of the community to achieve favorable decisions with the City Council on the issues will depend upon which of the following approaches will be taken:

One approach can be called piece meal. Mr. Tubbs stated that by using this approach owners of land are able to exert considerable and often the only pressures as to how the land is to be used and that the results are not always in the best interests of the rest of the Community.

The other approach is a planned one and by using this approach the City Council and the citizens compare the adopted plan with individual land use request to determine if the best interest of the whole community will be served.

Mr. Tubbs explained that it is necessary to develop a land use plan for the community for the benefit of all citizens in the area.

Mr. Bechtel, Planner in charge of preparing the Forest View Development Plan,

projected a photo of the Future Land Use Plan. He explained how the plan is a compromise between what the Planners presented last June and what most area residents expressed they wanted.

Mr. Bechtel explained why higher than single family density was projected for various areas in the Forest View Community. He showed a slide of the Greenfields Apartment Project which is now under construction and pointed out the fact that it is a self-contained community since it has the necessary facilities needed by the families who will live there.

Mr. Bechtel pointed out the educational facilities planned for the community. Proposed Commercial and Industrial areas were indicated. He also explained the major street plan to serve the community.

Mr. Guernsey discussed the way to develop a Master Plan and to consider periodic updating in future years.

Mrs. Bretz requested comments from the audience be made regarding the proposed plan.

Discussion followed.

Dr. Grounds, 2835 E. Mt. Hope asked why there have been no results on his rezoning request to expand his Veterinary Hospital.

Mr. Guernsey stated that a Special Use Permit was recommended as the best alternative by the Planning Board; that this recommendation was before the City Council and that it was recommended that no commercial or multiple family be allowed in that particular area.

Mr. Novak, 4827 Aurelius Road questioned the flood plain area.

Mr. Frank Smith, 3115 Forest Road who owns a nursery, questioned additional building if necessary, to his business.

Mr. Guernsey stated that he could build certain types of buildings in the A-1 zone if he met the requirements of the Building Code and asked him to meet with the Building Inspector.

Mrs. Sandra Shafley, 2529 E. Mt. Hope, asked when the Red Cedar Park is to be started, and if people will be requested to leave at that time, and if there is a chance of having sewers there.

Mr. Guernsey stated that no one was trying to acquire land fronting on Mt. Hope but if one wishes to sell, the policy recommended is: The City would buy at the market value. He stated that the City will start to acquire land within 12 months. As far as sewers are concerned, the expense vs. the amount of homes to be served makes this unfeasible.

Mr. Roy Emery, 2022 E. Cavanaugh, appealed to everyone to consider the plan carefully, and requested an explanation of The Special Use Permit.

Mr. Guernsey explained about special uses.

Mr. Black addressed the Citizens Advisory Committee with regard to the fact that there are 3 categories, residential, commercial and industrial, but no provisions were made of office building area. He stated that the Board has before it a request for zoning a parcel, located between Jolly and Cavanaugh east of the expressway, to allow office buildings. He requested that the Committee give their views with regard to this request for a change in the Master Plan.

It was decided that the Committee is generally in favor of the rezoning.

The question was asked regarding the plans for future development of Boetcher Court.

Mr. Guernsey stated the Plan proposed that the land be an industrial area due to the existing industrial uses.

Mr. Warner Baxter, 3418 Forest Road and Mr. Gibbons, questioned the need for sewers on Irene Street and Mr. Tubbs stated that if they desire a sewer they should petition City Council.

Mr. Rex Carl questioned the proposed use for his land (20 acres) located at the end of Luwanna Street and considered to be in the flood plain. He asked if the Plan proposed to use this property for a park or cemetery.

Mr. Tubbs stated that the land is not recommended for cemetery use, and that there are three possible uses:

1. Allow filling;
2. Develop for park purposes;
- or 3. Leave it in its present state.

The third alternative not being fair to the property owners in the area.

He also stated that a sanitary land fill is not considered desirable for the Community, and that the Committee has recommended that this land be used for recreational purposes.

Mr. Hayden, Parks Director, commented that the area at the end of Luwanna Street represents only a small portion of land owned by the City for Park purposes. He also stated that the proposed Plan is not inflexible and he feels that the proposed use as a park is the best use for the property; but also wants the Committee and the owners satisfied.

Mr. Robert Foote, 2507 Hazlewood, indicated concern that his area was assessed for Greenfield sewers.

Mrs. Hagg, who lives south of Cavanaugh stated that she wants Aurelius Road widened.

Mrs. Gerald Patterson, 2243 Luwanna Drive, questioned the filling of Lake Luwanna.

Mrs. Homer Rippe, Eastlawn Drive, asked if the Plan was a tentative one, or a set one, and feels that there should be more commercial and less industrial.

Mr. Tubbs stated that the Plan was "Proposed" but it would be flexible.

Mrs. Atherton, Wabash Street questioned a secondary street.

Mr. Emil Kletke, 3016 Manley, called for a show of hands vote for and against the Plan.

Mrs. Metzger, 2614 Wabash, stated that she is in favor of the Plan.

Mr. Bliss, owner of 20 acres south of Forest Nursery, commented on his desire for multiple housing land uses.

Mr. Trapp, 3106 Manley, favors the proposed plan and wishes no more multiple.

Mr. Ed Solomon, 3412 Aurelius, objects to the Planning Advisory Committee and stated that he feels that the Planning Board and City Council are fooling the people of the Community.

Gilbert Holmes, 2914 Forest Road, invited Mr. Bliss and Mr. Clyde Olin to the next Citizens Advisory Committee Meeting.

Mr. Perrin spoke with regard to the various questions which had arisen over the course of the meeting and explained the need for controls over zoning in the Forest View and other areas for the benefit of all concerned.

RECESS

Mr. Guernsey presented background information which initiated the Central City Master Plan Revision.

Mr. Guernsey then introduced Mr. Thomas Kubanek of the Planning Department staff.

Mr. Kubanek presented an analysis of the area and the recent land use changes which have taken place due to Urban Renewal and Community College expansion. He stated that studies of the area are as follows:

1. Marketability studies of the area conducted by Welsh & Associates and Gladstone & Associates indicate that this area should serve the Central City. It possesses the factors necessary for use in office, public and commercially related uses. It is geographically located in an area which is best suited for supporting Central City activities.

2. The Core Area Plan forms a physical and functional nucleus of development

in the Central City. From this nucleus a coordinated pattern of land use should play a supportive role for achieving the goals of the Central City by providing activities which generate people concentrated office, public and commercially related uses.

3. Economic projections by Gladstone & Associates, the City's and Regional Economic Consultants, stated that "Despite the vast amount of potential industrial land already zoned in the Lansing area much of it cannot be considered really prime industrial land. Much of it is adjacent to the railroads and is accessible only by the City Street System. Access of this type just cannot be considered as adequate for modern industry, which has a high dependence on motor freight and a real need for a network of secondary highways to accommodate commuting workers.

4. When the findings and recommendations of the economic consultant are weighed and compared with the Master Plan designation of the area east of the Grand River the conclusion is that the Master Plan is unrealistic to expect this area to compete for future industrial development with other more favorable locations, both within Lansing and throughout the Tri-County region.

Mr. Kubanek then recommended that the land use in question be changed from industrial to office, public and commercially related uses which serve the Central City.

Mrs. Bretz requested comments from the audience be made regarding the proposed change of the Central City Development Plan.

Mr. Hank Reniger (business operator near the area under discussion) asked how this change would affect his business relating to retail and warehousing facilities.

Mr. Guernsey stated that this change would not affect his property at present and no change of land use was contemplated for the area where his building is located.

General questions were asked as to what uses would be permitted in this area.

Mr. Kubanek stated that uses such as professional offices, transportation center, riverfront park, convention center hotel, educational facilities and other related commercial uses which would serve the Central City would be allowed.

Mrs. Bretz asked if anyone was opposed to the proposed change.

No one at the meeting made any statements of opposition to the proposed change.

No action was taken by the Board.

Meeting adjourned at 11:15 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE POLICE BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 17, 1968

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Russel Lawler.

ROLL CALL

Commissioners present: Brooks, Lawler, Lawry, McConnell, Noack, Rollis, and Dutzy—7.

Commissioners absent: Guyseman—1.

Commissioner Guyseman was excused from the meeting.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letters of appreciation for services rendered by members of the Police Department

were received from: Lansing Business & Professional Women's Club; Miss Catherine Dettling, Asst. Principal, Walter French Jr. High School; Tulsa Oil Corp.; Metropolitan Lansing Fine Arts Council; Battle Creek Police Dept., Mr. and Mrs. Robert Richardson; and Walt Sorg and Paul Kowal, WJIM-TV.

Received and placed on file.

APPLICATIONS AND RESIGNATIONS

December 13, 1968

Members of the
Police Board

JOHN T. ANAS,
HAROLD A. MOORE,
LOUIS F. ADADO,
LUCILE E. BELEN,
ROGER T. MAY.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

That the Director of Parks and Recreation be authorized to purchase two chippers.

Adopted by the following vote:

Unanimously.

Anthony Nosal spoke.

By Councilman Moore—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

That Councilman Ferguson be excused from the session.

Carried.

By Councilman Anas—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

That the rule prescribed in Sec. 5.5 (g) of the Charter, relative to considering business not on the agenda, be waived.

Carried.

By Councilmen Anas and May—

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Lansing:

Robert J. Renstchler, executive director, Community Services Council, presented resolution adopted by them relative to Jolly-Cedar Turnkey Housing Project.

Dwayne Allen spoke.

Floyd Decker spoke.

Lyle Johnson, 1412 Miller Rd., spoke.

Council adjourned at 9:30 P.M.

THEO FULTON,
City Clerk.

Lansing, Michigan

March 10, 1969.

F/B

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, November 12, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:15 P.M. by Chairman Ramona Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds.

Absent: Duncan.

HEARINGS

SS-35-68—Industrial Park Standards.

Mr. Nino presented the proposed new zoning ordinance with regard to special

industrial requirements which seek to achieve a new kind of environment in industry and can operate without adversely affecting adjacent property and at the same time enjoy advantages for itself.

Mr. Nino explained the purpose of the proposed ordinance and gave a general description. He stated that this is not to be a replacement for "H" industrial and "I" industrial but a new category with different requirements for each classification. He stated that the purpose of the category is a park-like environment.

Mrs. Ranger, 6725 Kingdom, stated that this will affect her if an industrial Park

goes in near her area and wanted to know the specific uses.

Mr. Nino stated that this was not for any specific area but a general area.

Tom Seibold (Birmingham, Mich.) stated that he has property on Kingdom and feels that Industrial Park is a good zoning buffer between residential and industrial.

Mr. Black asked if the requirements read were similar to the ones in Detroit.

Mr. Seibold stated that they were basically similar and that he is working with them now. He feels this zoning is necessary.

Bob Ranger questioned the responsibility for the cleanliness of these areas and who decides what is considered obnoxious.

Mr. Nino explained that the responsibility for policing rests with the City. He also stated that the ordinance sets forth the standards for noise levels, smoke emission, dust and dirt, odors, toxic gasses, glare and heat, vibrations and radio active emission.

Bill Forgrave, Midway Realty Company of Lansing stated that he feels no need for new zoning and that the present zonings are sufficient. He stated that he is against the new zoning ordinance as it is a detriment to the City of Lansing.

Mr. Reynolds asked Mr. Forgraves if he would be in favor of three park zonings, i.e., "H" Industrial Park, "I" Industrial Park and Planned Industrial Park.

Mr. Forgrave stated that he doesn't think that it is up to the City to have park but up to the developer. He said that if the developer has industrial zoning he will see to it that he has a park or he will not be able to stay in business because of competition.

Mr. Black disagreed, stating that not all developers will have a park. Mr. Forgrave questioned the parking requirements vs. plat parking requirements and setbacks vs. plat setbacks.

Mr. Nino questioned the legality of Mr. Forgrave approving a Plan only before the prospective purchaser can buy.

Mr. Black introduced two letters which had been received regarding the proposed standards. Received and placed on file.

Referred to Ordinance Committee.

Mr. Black made a motion that the Ordinance Committee meet with the developers who are against the proposed Planned Industrial Park, to review the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Gaus suggested that they also invite the people who are for the adoption of a new ordinance.

P-12-68P—Mt. Vernon Park, Preliminary Park.

Mr. Main of the planning staff discussed the proposed land use which includes a shopping center, multiple housing, single family housing, and a park.

Charles Woodruff, 3708 Delta River Dr., questioned the lot sizes of the single family housing.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-97-68—2300-2400 E. Jolly Road.

Mr. James E. Burns of the law firm of Farhat, Burns, Treleaven & Luoma, 417 Seymour, represented the petitioner. He stated that he has a plot plan and floor plan for various units proposed.

Mr. Black asked if there is a site plan.

Mr. Main showed the site plan.

Mr. Black questioned the parking.

Mr. Gaus stated that the proposed number of units is greater than the standards for DM:1 zoning. 168 apartments and 100 townhouse units. Gilbert Holmes, 2914 Forest Road, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer of the Forest View Citizens Committee stated that at the Forest View Citizens Committee Meeting October 30, 1968 that all interested parties were invited to this public hearing of November 12, 1968 and also that letters were sent from the Planning Department to individuals regarding this meeting.

Mr. Holmes spoke for the Forest View Citizens Committee, stating that at the October 30, 1968, meeting the citizens were opposed to this rezoning at the offset because it is a residential area. He stated that residents surround the area proposed for rezoning except on the south side. Mr. Holmes said that this proposed rezoning was discussed in detail and the general consensus is that it would not be good for the community in general; therefore recommending that the Planning Board disapprove the requested zoning and rezone to a lower density. This motion was approved at the Forest View Meeting with no dissenting votes.

Roy Emery, 2022 E. Cavanaugh, questioned the plans for schools due to the proposed high density. He requests denial until there are plans for schools.

Mrs. Bretz requested a show of hands of people present with regard to this petition.

Referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-98-68—3437 Forest Road.

Leland Carr, attorney for petitioner, spoke with regard to the proposed Faculty

Club stating that he had previously submitted a site plan and requested to submit to the Board a complete site and floor plan. He stated that the Board of Directors and the President were present to answer questions.

Dr. Bowman discussed the purpose of the proposed club. He described it as being a professional and social gathering place.

Gilbert Holmes, representing the Forest View Committee stated the opinion was voiced at their meeting on October 30, 1968. This proposal would not be objected to providing there were certain restrictions. The restriction being that the property bordering on the west on the proposed rezoning be suitably screened to prevent noise or any appearances which might be adverse to the property owners bordering the proposed club.

Mr. Carr advised that they realize the sewage system has to be extended, that they have been in contact with the city regarding this matter, and recognize that there will be expenses involved. There is an extension of sewer line that will be required in the area regardless of the proposed uses. The Faculty Club plans to hold a meeting with all property owners abutting Forest Road who would be concerned about the costs for extending the sewer line. He did not feel this matter need concern the Planning Board at this time.

Frank Smith, 3115 Forest Road, felt that before approval or disapproval of this plan the meeting as suggested should occur.

Don Cross, 3509 Forest Road, spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning, due to the proximity of single family homes, the sale of liquor on the site, additional traffic.

Lee Cross, 3631 Forest Road, spoke in objection.

Charles Reed, 3636 Forest Road, questioned the sale of liquor on the site. Mr. Carr advised that no license has been made, but did assume there would be an application for a club license. Mr. Reed stated he was in objection to this due to the sale of liquor and the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed use.

Jim Bliss, 3124 Forest Road, objected because of the cost of sewers.

Ronald Flynn, 3500 Forest Road, stated he was a member of the faculty and in support of this petition.

Robert Cross, 3637 Forest Road, spoke in objection.

Approximately 15 persons were present in regard to the proposed rezoning.

Matter was referred to the zoning committee.

Z-99-68

Joe Petovello, 4315 Appletree Lane, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the NE corner of Miller Road and S. Logan Street from A-1 family to E-2 drive in. (Mr. Petovello is a representative of an Oil Co.) He stated that this property was assigned A-1 district upon annexation to the city. A high rise sign is proposed to be erected. A drawing showing the exact location and specifications of the proposed sign was presented for the Board's information.

Mr. Black questioned if the sign would be in violation of height regulations and Mr. Nino advised in the negative.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-101-68

Louis E. Legg, Jr., 5035 S. Cedar, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5035 S. Cedar Street from A-1 family to F commercial district. The rezoning is requested to zone property in conformance to its use.

Mr. Gaus asked if the petitioner had any intention of changing the use of the property and he replied it would be possible.

No one appeared in objection to the proposed amendment.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-102-68 and Z-103-68

These petitions were initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 4100 Block of S. Logan and 4220 S. Logan from F & J to D-M:1 district. They are the result of the Board's adoption of a land use plan and policy for South Logan Street between Holmes Road and 1-96 expressway.

Mr. Nino advised that a letter of the property owner had been received in objection to the proposed rezoning.

Matter was referred to the zoning committee.

Z-104-68

This petition was initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property at 4711, 4909, 4915 S. Logan Street from A-1 family to D-M:1 multiple and D-1 professional. This petition was initiated in accord with the Logan Street Plan.

No one spoke in objection.

Matter referred to zoning committee.

Z-105-68

This petition was initiated by the Planning Board to rezone property in the 5900 block of S. Pennsylvania Avenue. The property was released from public adjacent property owners.

William McClintock spoke in support of the proposed rezoning.

William Forgraves spoke in opposition stating that the property is deed restricted against parking.

Zig Kowalski spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning to J parking.

Matter referred to zoning committee.

Z-106-68

This petition was initiated by the Planning Board to rezone the property adjacent and east of the sanitary land fill located at 5801 Aurelius Road from A-1 family to H light industrial.

William Forgraves spoke in objection to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Kowalski questioned if the Planning Board was aware that there is a long standing agreement that this landfill will be a park.

A property owner on Pinetree Road stated that he was aware that another property owner has a deeded right of way across the subject property.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-107-68

Petitioner did not appear in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 2900 block of Averill Drive from A-1 family to C-2 family.

Mr. Charles Main, 3527 Brisbane, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning, and said that he was speaking in behalf of another property owner nearby.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-108-68

Mr. Clark Ash appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 800 Center Street from C-2 family to H light industrial. He submitted photos of the surrounding property, and thought the proposed rezoning would improve the area.

Gerald Bump, 816 Center Street, spoke in opposition to the proposed rezoning. He submitted a petition in opposition containing six signatures. Received and placed on file.

Six persons were present in opposition to the proposed rezoning.

Mr. Nino commended Mr. Bump on his ability to articulate planning concepts.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-109-68

Mr. Orlo Jennings, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 5219 S. Logan Street from A-1 family to F commercial district. Mr. Jennings stated he wished to sell his property and prospective buyers are interested in it as commercial property. Mrs. Vance, real estate agent stated that the offers they have received for the property stipulate commercial zoning.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Z-110-68

Art Faggion, petitioner, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 3012 N. Seventh Avenue from A-1 family to H light industrial. He stated he has been subjected to vandalism and he is thinking of providing storage space only.

Mr. Belbeck, 805 Sanford asked that the petition be withdrawn temporarily due to the pending North East Street Study, and invited Mr. Faggion to attend their meetings.

Motion by Fink seconded by Heino that this petition be tabled thirty days allowing an opportunity for the petitioner to work with the North East Street Committee regarding development of the area.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-111-68

No one appeared in regard to the petition to rezone property at 4525 and 4528 S. Center Street from A-1 family to F commercial district.

Matter was referred to the zoning committee.

Z-112-68

Mr. Lynn Sible appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 1309-1317 E. Grand River Avenue from C-2 family to F commercial district. He stated his present building is old and that he needs a new one.

Dale Simons, 1211 Clark Street adjacent property owner, stated he was completely in support of the proposed rezoning. He

submitted a letter in support of this petition. Received and placed on file.

Matter referred to the zoning committee.

Recess 9:45 P.M. to 10:15 P.M.

BUSINESS SESSION

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus that the minutes of August 6, August 20, and September 3 to be approved subject to correction of typing error on page 2 of the August 6 minutes.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-73-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at 1017 Reo Road be rezoned to a community unit plan subject to a satisfactory landscaped plan.

The basis for the Board's approval is as follows:

- (1) The Planning Board is assured that the type of building proposed on the site plan, namely six, four unit module structures, has been harmoniously integrated into the area and serves as a good transition between single and two family districts on the north and east of the subject property and a townhouse development on the south. Therefore the Board believes that adjacent property shall not be adversely affected.
- (2) The site development layout and location of off-street parking areas will assure that the general intent of the Community Unit Plan chapter of the Code is satisfied. This addresses itself to the promotion of the public health, safety, morals and general welfare. Proper development standards which we suggest this submission contains should satisfy these requirements.
- (3) The plan is in keeping with the general policy intent of the S. Logan Street Land Use Plan.

Finally, in conclusion, the Board recommends this rezoning to the Council subject to final landscape plans being suitably worked out with the Planning Department.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-85-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property at the 2200 block of West Miller Road be rezoned from A-1 family to community unit plan to permit development of 330 townhouse units.

The Board approved the Community Unit Plan subject to the following conditions:

1. That the project be developed in accordance with the approved site plan and landscape plan.
2. That the property be platted prior to development of the project.
3. That low evergreen plantings be provided along the crest of the 3 ft. high rolled berm, as shown on the site plan.
4. All recommendations by other public agencies be compiled with, unless modified by the agency or the Planning Department.

Any change of zoning should be in conformance with an overall development plan. One that takes into consideration existing and potential land use development, public utilities, physical features and facilities available.

In this case there is a proposed development plan for the area and was formally adopted by the Planning Board July 2, 1968. This plan took into consideration the existing land use development, public utilities, physical features and facilities available.

The proposal now under consideration is in conformance with this development plan and can be adequately served by the necessary public utilities and facilities.

The site plan as submitted indicates the extension of Edgewood Boulevard which is proposed to eventually extend west to intersect with Logan Street. That portion of Edgewood Boulevard which is proposed to extend from the west boundary of the project to Logan Street has not been secured, but the most desirable route has been presented to the Board for consideration. Therefore any future planning or development of the area to the west which involves Edgewood Boulevard will require acquisition or dedication of the necessary street right-of-way.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-89-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property

at 1023 W. Ottawa Street from D-M to D-1 district be denied.

The Board has based its recommendation upon the following factors:

1. The change is not in conformance with the Central City Development Plan approved by the Council and the Board.
2. Conversion of the residence into offices would seriously over-burden the lot and could not provide sufficient parking.
3. Ingress and egress to the site from Logan Street would create an undesirable turning movement which Logan Street can ill afford.
4. The change may adversely affect living conditions in the neighborhood which is basically low density single detached housing and can so remain for some years unless adversely affected by intensive use zoning.
5. Given the shortage of an older sound housing stock which serves the market for many potential home owners we should be careful not to indiscriminately zone land so as to materially reduce this stock of housing.

For the above reasons this Board is convinced that this rezoning should be denied.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-93-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council the petition to rezone property at 711, 715, 727 N. Capitol Ave. and 210 Saginaw St. be approved for rezoning from D apartment to D-1 professional district.

The property under consideration is located within the boundaries of the Central City Development Plan and is set aside for office use.

At the present time a number of uncoordinated office uses are occurring within the residential areas of the Central City. While this provides an economic benefit to the owner of such properties it is creating a liability to the City as a whole. Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking and incompatible land use relationships; stimulating further requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

The Board believes that by taking the necessary steps to zone properties in accord with the Central City Plan, it will in effect discourage further scatterization of

office use and promote implementation of the Plan that has been accepted by the Planning Board and City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-94-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council the petition to rezone property at 209, 211 W. Lapeer Street and 531, 535, and 505 N. Capitol Avenue to rezone from D-M multiple dwelling to D-1 professional district.

The property under consideration is located within the boundaries of the Central City Development Plan and is set aside for office use.

At the present time a number of uncoordinated office uses are occurring within the residential areas of the Central City. While this provides an economic benefit to the owner of such properties it is creating a liability to the City as a whole. Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking and incompatible land use relationships; stimulating further requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

The Board believes that by taking the necessary steps to zone properties in accord with the Central City Plan, it will in effect discourage further scatterization of office use and promote implementation of the Plan that has been accepted by the Planning Board and City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-96-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 215, 205 W. Saginaw, 601, 615, 617 N. Capitol and 212 W. Lapeer from F commercial to D-1 professional be approved.

The property under consideration is located within the boundaries of the Central City Development Plan and is set aside for office use.

At the present time a number of uncoordinated office uses are occurring within the residential areas of the Central City. While this provides an economic benefit to the

owner of such properties it is creating a liability to the City as a whole. Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking and incompatible land use relationships; stimulating further requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

The Board believes that by taking the necessary steps to zone properties in accord with the Central City Plan, it will in effect discourage further scatterization of office use and promote implementation of the Plan that has been accepted by the Planning Board and City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-95-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 211, 213 W. Oakland Avenue and 801, 807, 811, 815, 823-25, 827-29, 831 N. Capitol and 210, 212 W. Madison Avenue from D-M multiple to D-1 professional district be approved.

The property under consideration is located within the boundaries of the Central City Development Plan and is set aside for office use.

At the present time a number of uncoordinated office uses are occurring within the residential areas of the Central City. While this provides an economic benefit to the owner of such properties it is creating a liability to the City as a whole. Indiscriminate spot zoning of residential property generally creates parking and incompatible land use relationships; stimulating further requests for marginal development, declining values in adjacent residential properties and weakens the market potential of logical and desirable office areas.

The Board believes that by taking the necessary steps to zone properties in accord with the Central City Plan, it will in effect discourage further scatterization of office use and promote implementation of the Plan that has been accepted by the Planning Board and City Council.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-115-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend that the

petition to rezone property at the northeast corner of Miller and Waverly Road from D-M multiple family to D-M:1 multiple be approved. Such a rezoning will permit the clustering of apartments with a one lot, one building kind orientation requiring platting of this land. While it is true that rezoning results in a lesser density, this is not going to affect the developer's plans since their density proposal is less than that permitted in a D-M category and in fact is less than the D-M:1 category.

Motion approved by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Z-92-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 4700 Collins Road from A-1 to D-1 and F Commercial be approved.

The following factors influenced the decision of the Board:

1. The site is unique in the sense that it is isolated from the City of Lansing and because of its geographical relationship to lands owned by Michigan State University it will remain within a rural environment.
2. Because the site is isolated and cannot support neighborhood services if developed residentially, non-residential use of the property is most appropriate.
3. Michigan State University most likely will continue to use its lands for agricultural purposes continuing the rural environment.
4. The available land is larger than can reasonable be marketed for only expressway service facilities which would be the most appropriate use of the land.
5. There is a need for some professional office land and/or research-office oriented facilities who seek and desire a campus or rural like environment.
6. The rezoning of this land as requested cannot adversely affect any adjacent lands.
7. The developer proposes to cause private restrictions to be placed on other lands to be developed over and above what they require for an "image type" structure so as to insure compatibility and a harmonious integrated development theme.
8. This rezoning is supported by the Forest View Citizens Planning Committee.

The Board does not agree with the proposal to zone a parcel of land fronting on

Jolly Road to "F" Commercial, but instead would recommend that this parcel be rezoned for professional offices. In addition, the Board would further recommend that the parcel of land situated at the northwest corner of Jolly Road and Collins which was not included in this petition be likewise rezoned to a Professional Office District.

In consideration therefore, the Board is recommending that the northernmost part of lot 2 of the Hospitality Motor Inn Subdivision be rezoned for "F" Commercial District as applied for and the remainder of lot 2 be rezoned for D-1 Professional Office District together with lands located at the northwest corner of Jolly and Collins Road which were not a part of the ownership of the lands included in the petition.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-7-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the revised preliminary plat of Bardaville Plaza be tentatively approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That an additional stub street near the northern end from the north-south street to the east property line be provided.
2. All streets shall be developed with complete public utilities including water, sanitary sewer, storm sewer and complete street improvements including curb, gutter and sidewalk.
3. Street width shall be sixty six feet with thirty six foot pavement.
4. Approval of the plat by the Michigan State Highway Department.
5. That a temporary turn-around be provided at the end of the most southerly stub street.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

P-12-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Black that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the preliminary plat of Mt. Vernon Park be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That all streets be developed with complete public utilities, including water, sanitary sewer and storm drains and full street improvements including curb, gutter and sidewalk.
2. Relocated Waverly Road shall be 100 feet wide and Wilson Street 66 feet wide with 36 foot pavement. Cranbrook should be 60 feet wide with 32 foot pavement.
3. The existing Haze drain and its easement unless vacated should be shown on the face of the plat.
4. This approval shall expire one year from the date of Council approval.
5. Approval of the plat by the Michigan Department of State Highways.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

P-11-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the revised preliminary plat of Joshua Meadows be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. That the development of the plat be staged; primary development should occur on that portion of the plat lying west of Joshua extended. The balance of the plat should be developed in conjunction with construction of additional storm drainage facilities.
2. That the plat be developed with complete public utilities and full street improvements as required by the City of Lansing Subdivision Control Ordinance.
3. That the necessary right-of-way for the extension of Joshua Street to Armstrong Road be acquired and included in the plat.
4. All street rights-of-way shall be sixty six (66) feet with thirty six (36) foot pavement.
5. This approval shall expire one year from the date of City Council approval.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-30-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Black, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council the following resolution:

Whereas the Planning Board is cognizant of the need to provide for a new major street to serve the south and west sides of Lansing and,

Whereas the specific route for the proposed street has not been determined and,

Whereas the development of the area has been greatly accelerated in the past two years and within the next two years will include a new high school, several new residential developments and a shopping center, all dictating the need for the City to select a route and begin programming for the construction of the street,

Now Therefore be it resolved that the Traffic and Public Service Boards are hereby requested to work with the Planning Board to determine the most feasible route for this facility.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

SS-33-68

Tree Planting Policy in New Subdivisions—Referred to the Ordinance Committee for their consideration and recommendation.

ROW-13-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Black that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the request of Mr. Maner G. Nichols to vacate a 20 ft x 40 ft. alley located to the west of the property at 3020 S. Cedar Street be approved. The subject alley has not been improved or used as an alley and has no outlet to a public right of way. There are no objections by

any city departments to the vacation of this alley. There are no plans for a north south alley in this block so the Board recommends that the alley be vacated and deeded back to the former owner.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Heino and Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mr. Guernsey reported on the NDP Seminar to be held in Chicago on December 2, 3, and 4th.

Motion by Reynolds seconded by Heino that Mr. Guernsey be authorized to attend the seminar.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

COMMUNICATIONS

The Board discussed the drafted reply by Mr. Guernsey to Mr. Bruce Maguire.

Motion by Black seconded by Gaus that the Director be authorized to forward the reply with the changes suggested.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Motion by Black, seconded by Gaus that the next meeting of the Board be held on December 3, 1968, eliminating the regularly scheduled meeting of November 19, 1968.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 P.M.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, January 9, 1969

Meeting called to order by Chairman Mabel Houck at 7:35 p.m.

Present: Houck, Gaus, McComb, Wendrow, Rendon, Jones and Kelley—7.

Absent: Keep—1.

Mrs. Mabel Houck presented Roger Butterfield and John Petroff with engraved gavels for their service on the Board of

cruiting minority applicants for the various education programs.

IV. The Field Representatives have assisted in the operation of the Laboratory Confrontation Program, by securing the names of possible community participants.

V. During this period two workers have started jobs and two workers are scheduled to begin courses of instruction at L.C.C.

VI. A total of 12 community residents were assisted by the Field Representatives.

LABORATORY CONFRONTATION PROGRAM

Captain Jackson explained some of the highlights of the weeks confrontation up to this time. It was felt that a great deal is being accomplished. Mrs. Davenport also offered her impressions of the weeks events as a participant.

Discussion was held regarding a follow-up program to the Program. Dr. Louis Radelt, Director, Center for Police and Community Relations, Michigan State University has been contacted and will assist in a follow-up program.

SUB-COMMITTEES HOUSING

There was discussion regarding the Jolly-Cedar Project and what response from the Committee is necessary at this time; the need for low-cost housing is still apparent and what alternate plans are being made.

The Housing sub-committee is to meet with the Housing Commission at the earliest possible date.

RESEARCH AND PUBLIC RELATIONS

The proposal for Proposed Procedures for Handling Complaints of Police Misconduct between the Lansing Police Board and the Lansing Human Relations Committee was discussed. It is with the understanding that the proposal will function with the intention that amendments can be made. Also that any action taken or not taken by the Police Board should be reported to the Human Relations Committee promptly.

Mr. Lundberg moved that the Committee approve the Proposal. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion. Approved by the committee.

EDUCATION

No report.

EMPLOYMENT

The Employment committee has been designated to send letters to all department heads requesting the full name and position or classification of all minority group employees in the City of Lansing.

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
CATHY MILETT.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 17, 1968

Meeting called to order at 7:45 p.m. by Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Absent: Black, Duncan, Heino.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that

the minutes of September 17, 1968, October 1, 15, and 29, 1968 subject to the following corrections:

September 17, 1968—Page 8, 11th paragraph, second line, delete the words "rather only those" and change area in the third line to areas.

October 15, 1968—Page 3, 9th paragraph, strike last sentence "He stated that this rezoning might have an adverse effect on the rest of the plan."

October 15, 1968—Page 5, 4th paragraph, present should be presented.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

RE: Z-98-68

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the rules be suspended to allow Mr. Boger, President of the MSU Faculty Club to speak regarding the pending rezoning at 3437 Forest Road from A-1 commercial to F commercial.

Mr. Boger related events between the MSU Faculty Club and the residents in the area of the club's rezoning petition. He reported that the club had agreed to support the sewer extension up to the faculty clubhouse or to Collins Road, whichever the people want, \$2.50 per foot, or one-third the total cost, whichever, is highest. There are restrictions in this agreement which are: that the application for rezoning be approved; that the clubhouse facility be started within a year; that we are able to let satisfactory contracts, etc. 100% of the property owners to the west affected by the petition signed this sewer petition. Have had several discussions with the property owners to the east of I-496, who oppose the construction of the faculty club. Their objections have not been resolved at this time. He asked that the petition be considered one way or the other at this time.

Discussion followed.

Mr. Cross, Sr. objected to the sale of liquor, the additional traffic which would be generated by the proposed use, and could not see why the building could not be relocated on the site.

Those present were informed that this matter would be considered later in the meeting.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-7-68

Mr. Nino advised that the Planning Board was in receipt of a letter from Peter E. Chenard, P. E. regarding the street pattern of the approved preliminary plat of Bardaville Plaza. Mr. Chenard is of the opinion that a required street will be detrimental to both the subject property and the adjacent property as well.

Discussion followed.

Motion by Pawlak seconded by Fink that the Planning Board reaffirm their previous condition of approval regarding the requirement of the additional stub street in this plat.

The board's purpose in requiring this stub was to eliminate the need to create an additional intersection along North

Grand River Avenue. Covert Lane, which it becomes a dedicated public street, will actually be an extension of Amherst Drive which would extend all the way from Delta River Drive to Grand River Avenue. If it were to intersect with Grand River Avenue, we are sure that it would soon become a bypass and carry far more traffic than was ever intended. In addition, the additional intersection at Grand River Avenue will only contribute to further congestion of this arterial street.

The Board believes that their decision was sound and justifiable even though it does pose a problem with respect to future use of the parcel which will lie between the new street and Grand River Avenue. It will be difficult to demand low density residential use on this property even though the use could front on the interior street. On the other hand, a higher density residential or a professional office use would not be undesirable.

Mr. Duncan arrived at 8:25 p.m.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-98-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition to rezone property at 3437 Forest Road from A-1 to F commercial be approved and further suggest that the easterly drive way be moved to the west as far as possible.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that a chain link fence with redwood interwoven slats be constructed along the west property line of Mr. Donald Cross so as to complete a visual screen between the two properties.

The Board recommended this rezoning for the following reasons:

Ordinarily a rezoning would not be necessary to permit the intended use. Country club and golf club type facilities are ordinarily permitted in residence zones subject to special conditions, relevant to site size, proximity to residences, site plan review and other type regulations to insure their compatibility with the neighborhood. The proposed Ordinance before the Council and approved by the Planning Board would permit this use in the manner described above. The nearest residence that could be affected by the development is contiguous to the east boundary of the property. According to the site development plan the

physical structures will not be nearer than 240 feet from this residence while the parking lot is situated adjacent the freeway and therefore well removed from the privately owned residences on Forest Road east of the site. The swimming pool is located to the rear of the proposed structure and by this siting is out of view of homeowners. Furthermore the pool will be twenty feet lower in elevation than that of the residences on Forest Road, similarly with the parking lot. This will materially reduce the noise that may be heard by the homeowners.

In summary the following points have been made:

- a. This use is one which is ordinarily permitted in a residential zone subject to conditions. These conditions, if they existed, would have been met by the site plan which has been submitted.
- b. Topographical differences in the land make it possible to naturally prohibit the transportation of noise to abutting properties.
- c. The rural like environment of the existing housing acts to minimize incompatibility. If this were a dense residential area the situation could become incompatible.
- d. Screening can effectively overcome whatever inconveniences that may arise.

Based upon the above considerations the

Planning Board therefore recommended that the following property, more particularly described as:

That part of the Northwest $\frac{1}{4}$ of section 25 and the Northeast $\frac{1}{4}$ of section 26, T4N, R2W, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan, beginning at the East $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of said section 26, said corner also being the West $\frac{1}{4}$ corner of section 25; running thence South $89^{\circ} 23' 32''$ West 345.49 feet on the $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the Easterly right of way line of Highway I-496, thence North $0^{\circ} 23' 25''$ West 500 feet on said right of way line, thence North $89^{\circ} 23' 32''$ East 345.39 feet parallel with the East/West $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the East line of said section 26, thence North $89^{\circ} 33'$ East 528 feet parallel with the East/West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of section 25, thence South $0^{\circ} 24' 10''$ East 335 feet parallel with the West line of Section 25, thence North $89^{\circ} 33'$ East 16.5 feet parallel with the East/West $\frac{1}{4}$ line of section 25 thence South $0^{\circ} 24' 10''$ East 165 feet parallel with the West line of section 25 to the East/West $\frac{1}{4}$ line, thence South $89^{\circ} 33'$ West 544.5 feet on said $\frac{1}{4}$ line to the point of beginning, subject to any rights of way or easements of record, said described parcel containing 10,089 acres of land, more or less, City of Lansing, Ingham County, Michigan,

be rezoned from "A-1" Family Residence District to "F" Commercial District.

The Board would further have Council appreciate that it is cognizant of the objections to this rezoning by four homeowners in the area and that it has to its satisfaction given due consideration to these objections.

Amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

Z-108-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition to rezone property at 800-804 Center Street from C-2 family to H light industrial district be denied.

Motion by Fink seconded by Gaus that the above motion be amended to include a recommendation that the Building Inspector and/or Health Department be requested to take necessary action which might alleviate the present substandard conditions of the dwelling on the subject site.

The immediate area is located within the older portion of the city which was developed residentially on small lots. Center Street in this vicinity has been a dividing line between residential uses to the East and commercial and industrial uses between Center Street and Grand River.

The petitioner states that he desires to erect a 2,400 square foot building on a 6,534 square foot lot. This would necessitate the removal of the two existing buildings. It should be noted that this is an exceptionally small parcel of land to be used for an industrial development, and that after the building is erected, with the required setbacks, there is very little land left for off street parking or to buffer the adjacent residential development. At the present time there is land available within the city, zoned H light industrial which would accommodate the proposed use.

The area under consideration is within the Central City Development Plan, the Model Cities area and the Cedar-Larch Corridor Study. Any new use established on this land will remain for a long time and have a definite affect on the surrounding development. It should be realized that the present existing residential uses will remain for some time and deserve to be protected from the intrusion into the area of incompatible uses. This change would be contrary to the established land use pattern, east of Center Street, which is

predominately mixed one and two family residences. As such this zoning request can be considered a "spot zone" as the proposed change allows a greater intensity, non residential in nature, which could foster uncontrolled development in the area.

The recommendation contained within the Cedar-Larch Corridor Study recommends that the area under consideration be retained for residential development. The granting of this request would allow a direct encroachment into an existing residential development which is proposed to be retained.

One of the criteria for the Model Cities Grant, is to retain and improve the residential environment within the area. Permitting the intrusion of an industrial use could only lead to the further deterioration of an area that the Model Cities Program will try to improve.

For the above reasons the Board is of the opinion that its position is a rational one. The Board would further point out that there is a concerned group of property owners in this area that wishes to have a residential environment preserved.

Amendment carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

BUILDING AND PROPERTIES COMMITTEE

BP-13-68

Motion by Fink supported by Pawlak that the Planning Board recommend that the request of the Hazen Lumber Company to purchase a triangular parcel of land located south of the N. Y. Central RR right of way and east of South Logan Street be approved, subject to the retention of existing easements, and if a suitable purchase price can be arranged.

The property is vacant except for a spur railroad track, which traverses the property and a portion of a 30 foot roadway which crosses the southern portion of the parcel, both are covered by easements. Other City Departments have no objection to the sale of this property, if the existing

easements are retained and a suitable purchase price can be negotiated.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Bretz, Fink, Gaus, Duncan, Pawlak, Reynolds.

Nays: None.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

A progress report on the Capital Improvements Program for 1969-74 was distributed to the Board members for their information.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Mr. Guernsey reported on the advantages of the IBM Magnetic Tape Selectric Typewriter which is being considered for acquisition. It is felt this machine would save a great deal of typing time. The administration has examined this machine and will request transfer the necessary funds for the rental of the machine. The Redevelopment Department will also have access to this machine.

Motion by Gaus seconded by Fink that a formal request be authorized to Council for the acquisition of this machine for use by the Planning Department.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

COMMUNICATIONS

Letter from a committee of opposing residents on Forest Road east of the I-496 expressway regarding the rezoning petition Z-98-68 was received and placed on file.

NEW BUSINESS

Discussion occurred on a beginning trial period of hearing rezoning petitions and making a recommendation on them on the same date. Various procedures were discussed.

Motion by Fink supported by Gaus that the Planning Board hold their first meeting in January, 1969, on January 17, 1969, rather than on the 7th as scheduled.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.

C/M

Mr. Stuart was re-admitted and informed of the decision of the Board. He was also given a warning concerning the quality of work his men are performing.

Mr. Stuart agreed to have all corrections completed before the 14th of March and will make every effort to avoid any further violations.

Meeting adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

DONALD E. DEAL,
Secretary.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING BOARD OF THE CITY OF LANSING

Proceedings, December 3, 1968

December 3, 1968

7:30 P.M., Court Room 1

Sixth Floor, City Hall

Meeting called to order at 7:45 p.m. by
Chairman Bretz.

ROLL CALL

Present: Bretz, Gaus, Heino, Pawlak,
Reynolds—5.

Absent: Black, Duncan, Fink—3.

HEARINGS

P-13-66

S. Cedar Industrial Center, Preliminary
Plat.

Mr. Main of the planning staff discussed
the proposed plat in regard to size, terrain,
access, present zoning and street pattern
proposed.

Edward Bennett, 6900 Kingdon, spoke in
objection because of noise, odors, etc.

Mrs. Adams, 6835 Kingdon, asked about
a buffer between the proposed industrial
park and the residential properties. Mr.
Main advised that the developer has pro-
posed a buffer, a wall or planting strip.
The Planning Board is currently consider-
ing industrial standards which would apply
more rigid standards in this type of in-
stance.

Rayburn Jarstfer, 6732 Kingdon, spoke
in objection.

Ray Steeb of the Lansing Metropolitan
Development Authority questioned access
off Willoughby.

Mr. Kenneth Black arrived at 8:00 p.m.

Matter referred to the Streets Committee.

Z-113-68

Mr. Jonathan Watts, petitioner, spoke in
behalf of his petition to rezone property at
the southwest corner of Main and Buffalo
Streets from "B-1" Family to "F" Com-
mercial districts. The site is proposed for
construction of a day care center for chil-
dren. He spoke in regard to the need for
such a center, and that he felt it would be
an asset for the community.

No one spoke in objection.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Mr. David Duncan arrived at 8:05 p.m.

Z-114-68

Mr. Larry Daggett, petitioner, appeared
in behalf of the petition to rezone property
at 923 E. Paulson from "A-1" Family to
"H" Light Industrial district. He stated
he wishes to use the property for a sanitary
landfill operation. He felt the best use of
the land is to fill and use as industrial. He
has 45 acres in total and the area involved
would be 20 acres maximum. We have a
sanitary landfill operating in the Township
adjacent to site in question.

Lawrence Schmalbach, 805 E. Paulson St.,
spoke in objection to the proposed rezon-

ing, due to the noise, dust, trucks, and dumping and the fact that this site was proposed years ago for a city park.

Fred Belbeck, 805 Sanford, questioned further expansion plans for the area. He asked if the Health Department's opinion regarding the water level in the area had been considered, and stated that the people in the area are very interested in what is going to happen in this area.

Melvin Hawk, 805 Fredrick Street, was interested in the petitioner's ultimate goal for the land, and felt that a park and recreation area was needed more than an industrial site.

Mrs. L. Rathbun, 726 Community Street, spoke in objection of proposed use.

George Cutler, 801 Harris, felt that a landfill ordinance was a necessity for the city, and thought the petitioner should be cautious as to the materials used in filling the site.

Martha Allen, 735 Paulson, spoke in objection to the petition.

Don Jones, 815 N. Wisconsin, did not object to filling, as long as they don't burn on the site.

Sam Burnett, 911 Orchard Glen, objected to burning on the site, and was concerned about the safety of children in the area of the pit because there are no fences around it. He also objected to burning on the site and the traffic on Paulson Street.

Florence Jackson objected to dirt, noise, etc., resulting from the site.

The staff was requested to advise Mr. Daggett of the next North East Street meeting so that he could present his plans for the area to interested persons in the area.

Mr. Daggett stated that he does not burn, that the city burns elm trees, he concurred with citizens that the pit is too high and stated it would be filled prior to start of landfill because that is a requirement of the landfill code. Access would be off Paulson Street. Other entrances to the gravel pit have been blocked off. As to the future land use, two major manufacturing concerns are interested. Any proposal we have would enhance the property.

Mr. Gaus questioned how long it would take to fill? Mr. Daggett advised approximately ten years.

Dabney Rogers, 922 Orchard Glen, questioned what would be used as fill. Want to stop Oldsmobile and city truck from dumping in the area, and has asked the State Health Department to have them stop burning.

Mr. Hall asked what the petitioner intends to do with the swamp area which is also a health hazard.

Matter referred to Zoning Committee and Executive Committee.

Z-116-68

Mr. Stuart Dunning, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at the 2800 block of Pleasant Grove Road from "A-1" Family to "B-1" Family district. He stated that Oldsmobile has purchased the site of the church on 925 W. Main Street, necessitating this move. The present church is very fine and is well maintained, which gives an indication of the kind of people interested in relocating their church. Proposed church on Pleasant Grove would be a fine structure also, and there is no problem in regard to parking space. It is planned to have space for about 800 automobiles to park. The site is presently vacant. Feel this is an ideal location for the church.

Cornelius Pettit, 2515 Victor, agreed that the church on Main is a beautiful church and is well maintained. However, we have asked before that this property remain "A-1" Residential, and we would prefer still that it remain single family.

Mr. Hammer, 2245 Victor, opposed the petition because he also preferred single family on the site, and also because of the large number of cars which would be parked in back of his lot.

Robert Babb, 2503 Victor, questioned: 1) the main difference between "A-1" and "B-1" and 2) does the church plan to use the entire fourteen acres for church property or do they have another use in mind for part of the property. He did not oppose the church.

Mr. Main of the planning staff explained the difference between "A-1" and "B-1". Mr. Dunning advised that the church plans to use the entire site for church purposes. On part of the property they plan to develop a playground and welcome all children in the neighborhood to participate in the facilities.

Ed Roe, 2509 Victor, stated he would rather have a church on the site than apartments which were previously proposed. Only hesitation he had was that he had not seen a plot plan and did not know how the project would affect him. It is with this reservation that he objected. Otherwise, he had no objections.

Mrs. French, member of the proposed church, spoke in behalf of the petition.

Paul Koch, 2622 Victor, felt he would like to know more details on the arrangement of the church on the property and stated he was not opposed to the church.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-117-68

Michael Stafford, attorney, appeared in behalf of the petition to rezone property at 409-413 E. Mt. Hope Avenue from "C-2" Family to "E-2" Drive-In district. He stated that the petitioner, Shell Oil Company, propose to develop a service station, using this property and the property to the east on Cedar Street. He maintained that this is an ideal location for a service station. He pointed out that the commercial use now on the property has no setback other than the sidewalk, and the proposed use would have a large setback which would improve this intersection.

Mr. Remick, of the Lansing Board of Education, raised the question of the safety of the students in the area and suggested an overpass be taken into consideration.

Mr. Greevey, 2017 Alpha, member of the Walter French PTA, asked if Shell provided any type of safety factors for the school children in the area. He was in opposition to the petition.

Mr. Stafford introduced a pamphlet entitled "Today's Service Station" which contains pertinent facts regarding both automobile and pedestrian safety.

Mrs. Lucille Hedberg, 419 E. Mt. Hope, spoke in support of the petition.

Mrs. Regina Reeves, 317 E. Mt. Hope, spoke in objection to the petition.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

Z-109-68

Ray Davis appeared in regard to the petition by the Planning Board to rezone property at 5203, 5211, and 5223 S. Logan Street from "A-1" Family to "F" Commercial and "J" Parking. He stated he was the owner of the subject property and that he thought all three pieces of property should be the same zoning classification, that he would not be opposed in that case.

Matter referred to the Zoning Committee.

RE: Z-98-68

3437 Forest Road, "A-1" to "F"

Mr. Cross, Forest Road, spoke regarding the letter from Joe Barden which has been distributed to the Planning Board. He stated the Forest View Advisory Committee planned to meet with the MSU representatives and interested citizens regarding the above prefaced petition, which is the reason the delay of this petition has been requested.

Mr. Black felt that the Board should make their decision if the difference to yet be resolved between residents and MSU

were minor ones. He did not feel that some of the problems would be solved no matter how many meetings were held.

Mr. Duncan questioned why this rezoning had to be settled at this meeting, and could the Board not honor the request for delay. He supported the request of the Forest View Committee for postponement in an attempt to determine whether there is any possibility for changes at all. Thought it would be presumptuous on the Board's part to assume that there is no possibility of any reconciliation.

Recess 9:35 to 9:55 p.m.

ZONING COMMITTEE

Z-97-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by Edward Marion to rezone property in the 2300 and 2400 Blocks of East Jolly Road from "A-1" Family Residential to "D-M:1" Multiple, be denied and that a Community Unit Plan with a density not to exceed seven (7) dwelling units per gross acre be given favorable consideration.

Further, that if the submission is made shall comply with the Planning Board's policy with respect to Community Unit Plans. Should the petitioner not agree to amending his petition to a Community Unit Plan then the Board would recommend that the petition be denied.

In January of 1968, the Planning Board reviewed a petition to rezone this same land to a Community Unit Plan. The Board agreed that a Community Unit Plan would be suitable for this land and therefore tentatively approved the same subject to a satisfactory site and landscape plan. The Board advised the then petitioner that the gross density not exceed 8.5 dwelling units per acre.

This development proposal did not proceed as expected. Since that time the Forest View Master Plan and Citizens Planning Committee have made considerable progress towards finalizing a plan for this area. When this matter was brought to their attention they expressed their dissatisfaction with any proposal that would create densities as high as fourteen (14) dwelling units per acre. They were further concerned over the possibility that their community would have a disproportionate share of rental housing if this development were to proceed at the permitted density.

In analyzing this petition we take the position that:

1. On the basis of our previous study, public utilities in the area are adequate to accommodate a residential environment of higher densities than single family.

2. The surrounding environment is not going to be or is now conducive to single detached housing of a moderately priced range.
3. A medium density residential environment in our opinion would not be incompatible with the existing rural like residential environment.
4. Increasingly we must accept the fact that our primary concern is density and not necessarily housing types. It is through the vehicle of density regulations that we are able to plan the shape and size of the urban environment. Also through this vehicle we can influence the owner/renter characteristics of housing. In other words a low density will invariably be owner occupied while higher densities will be renter occupied. It should be stressed, however, that in either case the housing types may be in a multiple housing environment.
5. Planning in terms of density is more flexible and permits innovating design and the entry of new technological achievements.
6. By regulating the housing stock through density controls together with planned unit requirements subject to site plan and landscape plan approval the purposes of planning can best be achieved.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-98-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Duncan, that the petition to rezone property at 8437 Forest Road from "A-1" Family to "F" Commercial district be tabled for two weeks.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-99-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by the Wolverine Commercial Development Corp. to rezone property at 2621-2627 N. Grand River Ave. from "G-2" Wholesale District to "H" Light Industrial District be denied.

"H" Light Industrial zoning in this area is totally incompatible from the point of view of relationships to other abutting properties for the most part but more importantly because the site occupies a most visible position and therefore its development with the kinds of uses that could not be permitted in the "H" Light Industrial would be very unattractive to the passerby,

besides acting as a deterrent to development of lands to the west which are projected for higher density residential use.

A city should be characterized by pleasant views, sound and smells for the most part. While it is unrealistic to think this is totally achievable, nonetheless, most industrial land usage ought to be separated from a residential environment in the promotion of the above stated goal. The site in question will prove incompatible to projected adjacent usage.

While we agree the sites attributes for a residential environment have been destroyed by poor zoning practices, nonetheless a more intermediate kind of zoning is the most that is appropriate for this site. Such an intermediate zoning of this land is already in effect, namely the G-2 wholesale classification.

G-2 zoning considering the amenities of the area is now most realistic. In the proposed zoning ordinance before the Council we would think that a "B-4" General Commercial kind of zoning classification would be even more appropriate. Unfortunately, we do not have such a zoning category. Generally the total inadequacy of the present zoning code has lead to the unwarranted usage that exists generally in this part of the City and has created somewhat of a mess.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-100-68

Motion by Gaus, seconded by Reynolds, that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by the Standard Oil Co., to rezone property at 6099 S. Logan Street from "A-1" Family Residential to "E-2" Drive-In be granted.

The site is included within the area which was comprehensively studied in conjunction with the South Logan Zoning Plan. The Plan recognized this use as it was pre-existing and probably derives much of its market from the surrounding neighborhood. This location is however, in a rather sensitive position with respect to traffic flow due to the very poor design of the intersection.

This application was made because of Standard Oil Company's desire to erect a high rise sign in an attempt to attract freeway traffic from I-96 which is located approximately one-half mile south of the site. There is some question as to whether or not the zoning and building codes will permit the proposed sign in the location designed. It is the Board's opinion that the question of the sign is not central to the

issue of whether or not to rezone the property. As mentioned above, this request is in conformance with the South Logan Plan.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-101-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Louis E. Legg, Jr., to rezone property at 5035 S. Cedar Street from "A-1" Family Residential to "F" Commercial be granted.

The site under consideration is located within the commercial complex at the intersection of South Cedar Street and Jolly Road.

The existing zoning of the property is illogical, as all the surrounding properties are zoned and developed in a commercial nature. This situation is a result of parcel by parcel zoning, and the lack of a plan which address itself to the entire area.

The owners are now faced with the problems of limited expansion programs, re-sale value and land use changes that would be compatible with the surrounding area.

The Board is of the opinion that the change is reasonable and could pave the way toward a general up-grading of the site.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-102-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition to rezone property at 4100 block of S. Logan Street from "F" Commercial to "J" Parking to "D-M:1" Multiple be approved.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino—5.

Nays: Reynolds—1.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Motion by Duncan seconded by Gaus the vote on Z-102-68 be considered in open discussion. Motion carried by unanimous ap-

proval. Mr. Duncan stated that only seven Board members were present and six voting, therefore, any nay vote will affect a rezoning. In as much as this is consistent with the Logan Street Plan rather than go on record as opposing that plan which we have recently approved. I would recommend these two issues (102 and 103-68) be tabled until our next meeting with the hope that the non-voting member will become familiar enough to vote. Our absent member might also be here to participate since it is related to a previous policy decision of the Board.

Motion by Duncan seconded by Black that Z-102-68 be tabled to the first meeting of the Planning Board in January.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-103-68

Motion by Duncan seconded by Black that the petition to rezone property at the southwest corner of Logan and Mary Streets from "F" and "J" to "D-M:1" Multiple be tabled to the first Planning Board meeting in January.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-104-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the petition to rezone property at 4711, 4909, 4915 S. Logan Street from "A-1" Family to "D-M:1" be tabled thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous approval.

Z-105-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the property in the 5900 Block of S. Pennsylvania Avenue, be zoned "A-1" Family Residential. This change of Zoning was initiated by the Planning Board.

The property under consideration was excess Street R.O.W. and was released from public ownership by action of the City Council August 12, 1968, and is now owned by the adjacent property owners.

The Board believes that this change will prohibit the property from being used contrary to deed restrictions of Midway Industrial Subdivision No. 2 which prohibits off-street parking and building developments within 50 ft. of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-106-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the petition to rezone property at 5801 Aurelius Road, (east of the sanitary landfill) "A-1" to "H" Light Industrial be tabled thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-107-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to City Council that the petition by the Cambridge Development Co., to rezone property in the 2900 Block of Averill Drive, from "A-1" Family Residential to "C-2" Family Residential be denied as filed, and that lots 199 through 203 inclusive be rezoned from "A-1" Family Residential to "C-2" Family Residential and lot 197, 204, 205, and 214 remain in their present zoning classification ("A-1" Family Residential), all property being part of Scotsdale Subdivision No. 3.

The Board believes that this change will allow reasonable use of the land, providing a proper transition between the single family development and the potential multi-family development to the west.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

Z-108-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Duncan that the petition to rezone property at 800-804 Center Street from "C-2" Family to "H" Light Industrial be denied.

Mr. Fountain advised the Board that a call had been received from Mrs. Ash who advised the staff that "F" Commercial zoning would be sufficient for their needs.

Mr. Nino noted that this did not change the staff's opinions on this petition.

Mr. Black suggested this petition be referred back to the zoning committee for further consideration.

Motion by Black seconded by Reynolds that this petition be tabled for two weeks.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-109-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Orlo Jen-

nings to rezone property at 5219 S. Logan Street, from "A-1" Family Residential to "F" Commercial District be denied as filed, and that the south 10 ft of the property lying parallel to Ferley Street be rezoned from "A-1" Family Residential to "J" Parking District and the balance of the property be rezoned from "A-1" Family Residential to "F" Commercial District, within the "J" Parking strip there shall be provided a 3 ft. high rolled berm with low evergreen planting along the crest. Ingress and egress to the site shall be prohibited from Ferley Street.

The Board would further recommend that the properties to the north described as: Lots 16 and 17 ex. the se'ly 150 ft. Supervisors Plat of Prosperity Farms, City of Lansing, be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "F" Commercial.

Further that lot 19, Supervisors Plat of Prosperity Farms except the south 10 ft. be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "F" Commercial, and the south 10 ft. be rezoned from "A-1" Family to "J" Parking and that a continuous 3 ft. high rolled berm with plantings as required along the south line of lot 18 be provided within the "J" Parking strip to a point 25 ft. from Logan Street. Ingress and egress from Ferley Street shall be limited.

The site under consideration falls within the boundaries of the South Logan Street Policy Plan and is recommended for commercial expansion.

Development of this area occurred prior to annexation to the City of Lansing, uses were permitted to intermix, creating an undesirable land use relationship.

The Logan Street Policy which addresses itself to the existing mixed land use problems and community needs attempts to set aside a sufficient amount of commercial land, where it is strategically located in relation to transportation services, and those areas which are presently developed in a commercial nature. It is not reasonable to assume that residential development can be retained in these areas.

Z-110-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the petition to rezone property at 3012 Seventh Avenue from "A-1" Family to "H" Light Industrial District be tabled for thirty days.

Motion carried by unanimous vote.

Z-111-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition by Marjorie and Gerald Fletcher to rezone property at 4524 and 4528 S. Cedar Street Northwest corner Cedar and Potter, from "A-1"

Family Residential to "F" Commercial be granted.

The site under consideration is located within the strip commercial development along South Cedar Street therefore the requested change is not contrary to the established land use and zoning pattern.

Based on the established land use of the area and the existing use on the site (service station) the Board does not believe the change will adversely affect the surrounding area.

Z-112-68

Motion by Gaus seconded by Reynolds that the Planning Board recommend to the City Council that the petition to rezone property at 1309-1317 E. Grand River Avenue from "C-2" Family Residence to "F" Commercial be denied.

The report which the Board adopted in this matter states the following reasons for its recommendation opposing rezoning:

1. Grand River Avenue from Oakland to Pennsylvania is predominantly a residential street with some convenience retail shops which are an integral part of any residential community.
2. A rezoning as proposed is therefore contrary to the established land use pattern and would constitute an indiscriminate and capricious spot zone.
3. The existing non-conforming use is working a hardship on the area and is hastening renewal action in the area. The expansion of the use as is proposed would only further increase the rate of residential deterioration.
4. This general area will no doubt in the future require some renewal action. The area will obviously remain in a residential environment after renewal which is supported by the Master Plan. As a part of renewal action presumably, one would eliminate the indiscriminate incompatible uses. It would be folly and waste of public funds if such action at this time would result in the retrenchment of a use which future renewal action will condemn.
5. Lastly, it should be pointed out that a zoning change was denied by the City Council in December, 1967, for essentially the same reasons. The Board does not believe from its study of the area and possible Master Plan revisions that conditions have changed to now warrant this rezoning. In fact the Planning Board has been consistent in discouraging expansion of commercial development in this area of East Grand River.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

STREETS COMMITTEE

P-14-68F

Motion by Black supported by Gaus that the final plat of Bancroft Hills No. 2 be approved subject to the posting of financial security in the amount of:

Sidewalks	\$17,000.00
Curb & Gutter	13,600.00
Monuments	2,025.00
Gravel	6,000.00
Storm Sewer	23,000.00
Sanitary Sewer	30,000.00
Total	\$91,625.00

prior to the signing and affixing of the Municipal Seal. This approval and recommendation was by unanimous vote.

Motion carried by the following vote:

Yeas: Black, Bretz, Duncan, Gaus, Heino, Reynolds—6.

Nays: None.

Abstain: Pawlak—1.

SS-52-67

A progress report regarding the North East Street corridor Study was presented to the Board for their information.

SS-11-65

Mr. Guernsey reported that the Market Study was currently being printed, and he asked for the Buildings and Properties Committee's consideration before the release of the final report.

Mr. Guernsey reported that Mr. Bechtel of the planning staff had resigned his position in order to accept employment with the East Lansing Planning Commission.

Re: Jolly Cedar Turnkey

Mr. Duncan stated that in light of the fact that the Planning Board approved the project and due to the shortage of housing in the metropolitan Lansing area he moved that the planning board reiterate their support of the Jolly Cedar project which provides additional housing units within the boundary of Lansing as quickly as possible and urge that the City Council not appeal Judge Fox's decision.

Mr. Reynolds felt that the Board had taken their stand on the matter and that this is now a political action. He did agree with the point that the project should be completed.

Motion lost for lack of a second to the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 10:35 p.m.